The University of Chicago

THE SECULAR ACTIVITIES OF THE GERMAN EPISCOPATE 919 - 1024

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

BY
EDGAR NATHANIEL JOHNSON

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Reprinted from
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA STUDIES
Vols. XXX–XXXI, 1930–1931

The University of Chicago

THE SECULAR ACTIVITIES OF THE GERMAN EPISCOPATE 919 - 1024

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

BY
EDGAR NATHANIEL JOHNSON

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Reprinted from
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA STUDIES
Vols. XXX–XXXI, 1930–1931

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

TO MY
MOTHER AND FATHER

PREFACE

Es war noch sehr früh, als ich Göttingen verliess, und der gelehrte . . . lag gewiss noch im Bette und träumte wie gewöhnlich: er wandle in einem schönen Garten, auf dessen Beeten lauter weisse, mit Citaten beschriebene Papierchen wachsen, die im Sonnenlichte lieblich glänzen, und von denen er hier und da mehrere pflückt und mühsam in ein neues Beet verpflanzt, während die Nachtigallen mit ihren süssesten Tönen sein altes Herz erfreuen.

HEINE, *Die Harzreise.*

I confess that I have dreamed of doing more than the scholar immortalized by Heine dreamed of. And yet who can help wondering when he is through, or at any rate stops, whether he has succeeded with his own mass of citations in doing more than the work of what Georg von Below has called the *Stoffhuber*? I may at least hope that this attempt to isolate the secular activities—and these conceived in no very hard and fast terms—of a group of lively bishops may serve to bring into sharper relief a state of affairs hitherto presented rather more in the abstract. If, in addition, with less labor these pages bring to the reader a fraction of the pleasure they have brought to the writer in the course of their painful preparation, I shall be content.

To James Westfall Thompson, Professor of Medieval History in the University of Chicago, I must acknowledge gratefully my indebtedness for the suggestion of the subject and for the encouragement, stimulation and support that he has patiently lent to the completion of my task. To the faculty of the Department of History of the University of Chicago I must also express my appreciation of the years spent under their guidance. To the *Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung* of Berlin I owe thanks for assisting me to become better acquainted with much of medieval Germany that remains in the Germany of today. To the University of Nebraska I am indebted for its cordial willingness to participate in the publication of this study in its *University Studies*. Finally, to Dr. John Dean Bickford of the Hotchkiss School I must

express my great gratitude for generous and invaluable assistance of many kinds, especially in the avoidance of jargon, in the reading of proof, and in the making of the index. Even were such a thing possible, this is not to make a complete acknowledgment of all obligation. The others, including my sister Mildred, will know, I trust, that I am not ungrateful.

If time and opportunity permit, I should like to continue my study up to that point where the German ecclesiastical territorial state may be said to have been fully formed.

Lincoln,
June, 1932

. . . sub colore episcopatus ad saeculum sum reductus.

Pope Gregory the Great in *MGH, Epp.*, I, 5.

Causantur forte aliqui divinae dispensationis ignari, quare episcopus rem populi et pericula belli tractaverit cum animarum tantummodo curam susceperit.

Ruotger, Vita Brunonis, c. 23.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	Introduction	9
II.	Church and State	24
	A. Episcopal Opposition to the *Status Quo*	24
	B. Episcopal Independence and Ecclesiastical Policy	39
	C. The Bishops and the Nobility	57
	D. Episcopal Elections	67
	E. Ottonian Generosity to the Church	78
	F. *Servitia Episcoporum*	89
	G. Conclusion	94
III.	Bishops in Lorraine	101
IV.	Bishops in Italy	142
V.	Bishops on the Frontier	166
VI.	The Bishop as Civil Servant	189
VII.	The Bishop as Soldier and Builder	206
VIII.	The Bishop as Economic Administrator	223
IX.	*Epicurus Episcopus*	242
	Appendix	252
	Bibliography	256
	Table of Contents	266
	Index	269

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED FREQUENTLY IN FOOTNOTES

MGH	Monumenta Germaniae historica
SS	Scriptores
LL	Leges
DD	Diplomata
SSRM	Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum
Epp. Mer.	Epistolae Merovingici et Karolini aevi
JB H I	Waitz, Jahrbücher . . . Heinrich I
JB O II	Uhlirz, Jahrbücher . . . Otto II
JB O III	Wilmans, Jahrbücher . . . Otto III
JB H II	Hirsch, Pabst, Bresslau, Jahrbücher . . . Heinrich II
BRG	Jaffé, Bibliotheca rerum Germanicarum
SBBA	Sitzungsberichte der . . . Academie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin
SBWA	Sitzungsberichte der . . . Academie der Wissenschaften zu Wien
HZ	Historische Zeitschrift
BSGW	Berichte . . . der . . . sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The appearance of the monarchical bishop in the early organization of the church is its most outstanding feature.[1] His diocese so far supplants in importance the early Christian community, that in his own person he becomes almost synonymous with the church itself. In the respect paid him and in the affluence of his outward display he vies with the Roman provincial governor.[2] The increasing patrimony of the church comes under his guiding hand, and with time he becomes the dominant administrator in those towns where Roman municipal administration was decadent. Every bishop to some extent nourished ambitions similar to those of the bishop of Rome.[3] Yet we may not speak of the monarchical bishop as an independent person, even though his position within the state may be regarded as privileged and political. While there was still an emperor there was still an imperial will: the church functioned within and as a dependent part of the state.[4]

There are, however, some features of the development of the episcopate that become fixed and more pronounced as the new Germanic kingdoms are superimposed upon the church. Violent struggles to obtain bishoprics are but one of the signs of their increasing importance, while the exercise in almost all the new Germanic kingdoms of a firm royal control over

---

[1] A. Werminghof, *Geschichte der Kirchenverfassung Deutschlands im Mittelalter*, 20: der monarchische Episkopat, die Grundlage der kirchlichen Verfassung. J. P. Kirsch, *Die Kirche in der antiken Griechisch-Römischen Kulturwelt*, 236. *Cambridge Medieval History*, I, 145-148.

[2] J. W. Thompson, *The Middle Ages*, 300-1500, I, 49.

[3] Thompson, *An Economic and Social History of the Middle Ages*, 300-1300, 77, refers to a case in point, George of Cappadocia, bishop of Alexandria, "the broker-banker".

[4] Werminghoff, 16: die starke Bindung der Kirche und des jeweiligen Herrschers; p. 18, he refers to the church as Werkzeug und gleichzeitig Teilhaberin der staatlichen Gewalt. Kirsch, 717: die Kirche nur zu sehr abhängig von der weltlichen Gewalt.

the election of bishops is another.[5] In early Germanic Gaul the bishops as a group are the most influential class. Coming as they do in large part from the Gallo-Roman nobility,[6] they acquire increased influence as centers of resistance to the invading German culture, while to the Germans themselves they are the bearers of a respected and useful tradition. Sidonius Apollinaris of Clermont and Gregory of Tours may in this regard be taken as typical of their times.[7]

This importance is still further accentuated as the bishops become also economic and political towers of strength. The Merovingian was a golden era for the piling up of landed wealth, made inalienable by the church and often immune by the state. The bishop begins to appear as the careful manager of his lands.[8] He substitutes for the state in the construction of public works.[9] Within his city before the end of the Merovingian period he had in some instances already become political master; there were episcopal towns

---

[5] Werminghoff, 43. For royal influence on episcopal elections in Visigothic Gaul and Spain, cf. Kirsch, 721; Werminghoff, 41-43; P. Hinschius, *System des Katholischen Kirchenrechts*, II, 516-517. For Ostrogothic Italy cf. *Camb. Med. Hist.*, I, 449; Werminghoff, 33. For the Burgundian kingdom cf. Werminghoff, 45; for the Vandal kingdom, 28.

[6] In the seventh century the episcopate began to be notably Germanized: Werminghoff, 56; A. Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* (1904), I, 133-134.

[7] Hauck, I, 82-83; Thompson, *An Economic and Social History of the Middle Ages*, 78.

[8] E.g. Nicetius of Lyons in Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum*, IV, 36, *MGH, SSRM* I, 170: domos componere, serere agros, vineas pastinare diligentissime studebat. Cf. Hauck, I, 140, n. 1; *Camb. Med. Hist.*, II, 143.

[9] Sidonius of Mainz stems the flood of the Rhine, Felix of Nantes steers the course of the Loire, Desiderius of Cahors builds aqueducts. Cf. Dalton, *The History of the Franks by Gregory of Tours*, I, 226; Hauck, I, 131-132. Theodoric saw something peculiarly fitting in the construction of aqueducts by bishops: Nam quid aptius quam sitienti plebi provideat aquas sanctissimas sacerdos? (quoted by Dalton, I, 267).

with some taxing rights.[10] In cooperation with the secular nobility he was a real threat to an unpopular régime. One need only refer to Arnulf of Metz, or to Egidius of Rheims, that chronic rebel and convicted manipulator of royal grants,[11] or to the ostentatious Leodegar of Autun.[12] Gregory the Great himself, ambitious to extend his own control over the Frankish bishops, had difficulty at times in distinguishing between his earthly and his churchly activities.[13] Of the Merovingian kings, Chilperic, for example, was distressed at the state of episcopal affairs.[14] Yet even during these early stages of the secularization of the church one must not fail to note how the king was ready—nay rather, compelled—to take advantage of the growing secular power and worldly experience of the churchmen. The martial bishop, in particular, quickly became indispensable to the state.[15] Another

[10] Dalton, I, 8-9: "The bishop . . . was really a more important person in his district than any of the king's officers." Cf. Hauck, I, 131-132; *Camb. Med. Hist.*, II, 143-144.

[11] Gregory of Tours, X, 19, *MGH, SSRM* I, 432-433: In hac igitur causa primum episcopus fallax repertus est . . . . "nam ego novi me ob crimen maiestatis reum esse mortis, qui semper contra utilitatem huius regis matrisque eius abii, ac per meum consilium multa fuisse gesta certamina, quibus nonnulla Gallearum loca depopulata sunt." Dalton, II, 455-458; I, 86: "the subtle intriguer . . . ever plotting against the crown in the interests of the aristocratic party."

[12] Hauck, I, 396: Der rechtskundige, redefertige, prachtliebende Mann wurde ein Bischof im grossen Stil. Thompson, *The Middle Ages*, I, 202: "Leodegar was an adventurous, sanguinary, rapacious feudal chieftain, with nothing but the alb between him and the world."

[13] *Camb. Med. Hist.*, II, 146, 248-249.

[14] Gregory of Tours, VI, 46, *MGH, SSRM*, I, 286: Sacerdotes Domini assiduae blasphemabat, nec aliunde magis, dum secricius esset, exercebat ridicula vel iocos quam de eclesiarum episcopis. Illum ferebat levem, alium superbum, illum habundantem, istum luxuriosum; illum adserebat elatum, hunc tumidum. . . . Aiebat enim plerumque, "Ecce pauper remansit fiscus noster, ecce divitiae nostrae ad eclesias sunt translatae; nulli penitus nisi soli episcopi regnant; periet honor noster et translatus est ad episcopus civitatum." Haec agens, assiduae testamenta quae in eclesias conscripta erant plerumque disrupit. Cf. Dalton, II, 279; Hauck, I, 132, n. 5; 137, n. 6.

[15] H. Boos, *Geschichte der rheinischen Städtekultur*, I, 287: Seitdem bildet der kirchliche Grundbesitz die ökonomische Grundlage des fränkischen Heerwesens.

regular part of the bishop's royal service was the heading of diplomatic delegations.[16] To represent secularization on its lighter side we have the bibulous and sporting bishops,[17] although, to be sure, there were always those that were prominent and respected at court, in the school or in the

[16] Werminghoff, 50-54; Hauck, I, 145 and n. 4; Dalton, I, 268.

[17] Gregory of Tours has a striking picture of two brothers, Salonius of Embrun and Sagittarius of Gap: IV, 42, *MGH, SSRM* I, 176: Fratres et episcopi, qui non cruce caelesti moniti sed galea ac lurica saecularia armati multos manibus propriis, quod peius est, interfecisse referuntur; *ibid.*, V, 20. I, 218: Ita plerumque noctes epulando atque bibendo ducebant ut, clericis matutinas in ecclesia celebrantibus, hi pocula poscerent et vina libarent. . . . Redeunte aurora surgentes a coena mollibus se indumentis aperientes somno vinoque sepulti usque ad horam diei tertiam dormiebant. Sed nec mulieres deerant, cum quibus polluerentur. Exsurgentes igitur abluti balneis ad convivium discumbebant; de quo vespere surgentes coenae inhiabant. . . . Sic faciebant singulis diebus. Cf. Dalton, I, 87; II, 151, 195-197.

Gregory tells of other episcopal inebriates, e.g. Eunius of Vannes, V, 40, *MGH, SSRM* I, 233: Nimio enim vino deditus erat, et plerumque ita deformiter inebriabatur ut gressum facere non valeret (Dalton, I, 280, n. 1; II, 212); Gunther of Tours, X, 31, I, 447: Postquam . . . episcopus ordinatus est, vino deditus paene stolidus apparuit. Quae res eum in tantum amentem faciebat ut convivas quos bene noverat nequiret agnoscere (Dalton, I, 287; II, 475); Droctigisil of Soissons, IX, 37, I, 391: Qui propter nimiam, ut ferunt, putationem quarto instante anno sensum perdiderat. . . . Et licet esset vorax cibi ac putator vini extra modum . . . tamen nullum de eo adulterium quispiam est locutus (Dalton, I, 87; II, 407-408); Cautinus of Clermont, IV, 12, I, 148: . . . vino ultra modum deditus. Nam plerumque in tantum infundebatur potu ut de convivio vix a quattuor portaretur. Unde factum est ut epylenticus fieret in sequenti (Dalton, I, 87; II, 123).

Cf. P. S. Allen, *The Romanesque Lyric*, "Episcopal Courtesies," 247-249.

Dalton, I, 291: "The sees of France were filled by roystering captains, whose knowledge of religion and the duties of their new station was in inverse proportion to their knowledge of horses and dogs." Cf. Boniface to Pope Zacharias in 742, *MGH, Epp. Mer.*, III, 299: Modo autem maxima ex parte per civitates episcopales sedes traditae sunt laicis cupidis ad possidendum, vel adulteratis clericis, scortatoribus et publicanis, seculariter ad perfruendum. Cf. Hinschius, II, 522, n. 7.

Hauck (I, 402-403) speaks of complete demoralization and secularization; from the death of Dagobert to Boniface there were but three synods held.

chapel. For all this, it must again be noted, the Merovingian bishops were still not independent of the king. Their election if not a direct royal appointment, required royal consent,[18] even though this might well be venal.[19]

The more flagrant of these conditions within the Merovingian church were taken in hand by the Bonifacian reform, a reform that may be called monarchical in view of the royal and papal support given it.[20] Charles Martel and Pepin were earlier Charles the Greats in so far as their general position towards the church was concerned.[21] Charles therefore inherited the long established institution of a state-controlled church as well as a definite reform program. His devoted concern for every phase of the life of this greatly expanding Frankish church is but a magnification of his concern for his own private church at Aachen.[22] From another point of view

---

[18] Hauck, I, 146-148; Dalton, I, 290; *Camb. Med. Hist.*, II, 142. Werminghoff, 50: Sie (die Kirche) ward zum Werkzeug der Herrscher; p. 69 and n. 2: . . . kein erledigtes Bistum ohne Genehmigung des Königs seinen Vorsteher erhalten. . . . *MGH, Concilia*, I, 103. c. x. Council of Orleans in 549: Ut nulli episcopatum praemiis aut conparatione liceat adipisci, sed cum voluntate regis. *MGH, Capitularia* (Boretius, 1881), I, 21, c. 1, edict of Chlothar II of 614: Si persona condigna fuerit, per ordinationem principis ordinetur; certe, si de palatio eligitur, per meritum personae et doctrinae ordinetur; cf. Hinschius, II, 517-522.

[19] "At this time that seed of iniquity began to bear fruit, that the episcopal office was sold by the kings or bought by the clerics": Gregory of Tours, quoted in *Camb. Med. Hist.*, II, 142; cf. Werminghoff, 70.

[20] Hauck, I, 416; *Camb. Med. Hist.*, II, 146-147; *ibid.*, 537, quotation of Boniface to Daniel of Winchester: "Without the patronage of the Prince of the Franks I am able neither to rule the people of the church nor to defend the priests or deacons."

[21] *Camb. Med. Hist.*, II, 592, quotes Pepin: "Though at the moment our power does not suffice for everything, yet in some points at least we wish to better what, as we perceive, impedes the Church of God; if later God shall grant us days of peace and leisure, we hope then to restore in all their scope the standards of the saints." Dalton, I, 195: "Under Pippin the Short the episcopal council even assumed the character of a council of state." Cf. Boos, I, 188-189.

[22] Einhardi *Vita Karoli*, c. 26, *MGH, SS* II, 457: Curabatque magnopere ut omnia quae in ea gerebantur cum quam maxima fierent

it is the concern of the practical theocrat, who uses the church as a tool in the governance of his empire. In his first letter to Leo III he calls himself "the Representative of God, who has to protect and govern all members of God, Lord and Father, King and Priest, the Leader and Guide of all Christians,"[22] and he did in fact exercise a paternalism unprecedented in degree.[24] The church was to subserve more effectively the interests of the state by contributing to its revenue, participating in the actual business of government, and raising the moral tone of the whole population. In the whole range of Charles's legislation there is a conspicuous lack of strict differentiation between the secular and the ecclesiastical.[25]

The episcopate felt this strong controlling hand.[26] To Charles, after God, the bishops owed their election, and there was very little complaint about his choices.[27] They were invaluable at court and on mission; alongside of the counts they served as *missi*. If their position within the diocese needed to be still further strengthened, they were instructed to concentrate their attention there. If wandering or irregular rural bishops were to be suppressed,[28] if all clergy within the diocese were to be subject to episcopal supervision, then, said Charles, let the bishop concern himself with regular visitations. Let him scorn to imitate or vie with the secular nobility, either by excessive peregrinations in the interests of property holding or by the maintenance of a brilliant court with armed retainers. There were matters that pertained

honestate; aedituos creberrime commovens ne quid indecens aut sordidum aut inferri aut in ea remanere permitterent. . . . Legendi atque psallendi disciplinam diligentissime emendavit.

[23] T. Sommerlad, *Die wirtschaftliche Tätigkeit der deutschen Kirche*, II, 194: . . . Kaisertum Leiter des Gottesstaates und Herr der Kirche, und die Bischöfe nur die Organe seines Reiches . . . Cf. *Camb. Med. Hist.*, II, 617.

[24] Hauck, II, 248-249.

[25] Thompson, *Middle Ages*, I, 246: "One cannot draw a sharp line between church councils and *placita*." Cf. Werminghoff, 49.

[26] Krüger, *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, 29-31.

[27] Hauck, II, 185, ff.; Boos, 192-193.

[28] Hauck, II, 205 ff.

to the soul, to the synod, to the education of the clergy, concerns that were preeminently episcopal by nature.[29] The increasing regularity with which during this period episcopal synods were held and episcopal visitations made is some evidence that we are here dealing with something more than mere talk.

Upon the clergy as landowners with a developed acquisitive instinct Charles likewise kept an attentive eye, without, however, resorting to radical secularization, for he would protect church holdings, especially from a grasping lay aristocracy. Yet he is aware of the problems accompanying an illimitable expansion of landed church property, and his own contributions to it are few.[30] Those bishops who objected to the personal dependence that special royal protection of their property entailed nevertheless paid for immunity from the interference of royal officials by annual gifts of war-horses and weapons, by keeping the king and his retinue in case he abode with them, or by furnishing sustenance in case he stayed nearby. As landowners they supplied their military contingents.[31] The episcopate is thus involved in the material maintenance of the state. To make this support more stable, as well as to relieve the bishop of secular preoccupations, Charles fostered the development of the advocate, as a direct or indirect royal appointee to be supervised by the *missi*. He insisted upon the clergy's keeping careful accounts. At times he went so far as to use church property as benefices in favor of the nobility, but he was unable, what with grants of immunity and the use of bishops as state officials,

[29] Hauck, II, 205-210.

[30] The holdings of the bishops did not compare with those of the monasteries (Boos, I, 193-194). Cf. Hauck, II, 193-198, where Augsburg is credited with 1,500 manors and Salzburg with over 1,600. As with monastic holdings, a great part of the nominal holdings was in fact endowment of *Eigenkirchen*. Of the 230 churches under the bishop of Chur, in the time of Louis the Pious, but 31 were strictly episcopal; the rest were royal or lay *Eigenkirchen* (Werminghoff, 84). Of the churches of Salzburg in 788, 67 were ducal foundations (Thompson, *Middle Ages*, I, 246, n. 1).

[31] Werminghoff 60-63; cf. n. 15.

to check the growth of the church as a political entity.[32] In some discomfiture also, he had to witness worldly bishops and clergy in general engage in land-grabbing activities which could be described only as extortion, and which pointed a warning finger to a time to come.[33]

The performance of public penance at the behest of a bishop is a significant phenomenon, new in the ninth century.[34] The cropping out of a "hot-tempered, quarrelsome, calumniating, stubborn, unjust, and threatening" clergy of low birth is another.[35] An emphatic major chord, suggestive of coming episcopal victory, is struck in the discord of the ninth century by the policy of Nicholas I, by the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, and by the career of archbishop Hincmar of Rheims. The theme of the new movement was the subordination of the monarchy to the bishops, an increase of the ecclesiastical power over the secular, the substitution of a

---

[32] Hauck, II, 198-202.

[33] *MGH, Capitularia,* I, 163, *Capitula de causis cum episcopis et abbatibus tractandis,* of 811, c. 5: Inquirendum etiam si ille seculum dimissum habeat, qui cotidie possessiones suas augere quolibet modo, qualibet arte, non cessat . . . comminando de aeterno supplicio inferni . . . tam divitem quam pauperem, qui simpliciores natura sunt et minus docti atque cauti inveniuntur, si(c) rebus suis expoliant, et . . . per hoc plerosque ad flagitia et scelera propter inopiam . . . perpetranda compellunt; *Ibid.,* I, 165, *Capitula de rebus exercitalibus,* c. 2: Quod pauperes se reclamant expoliatos esse de eorum proprietate; et hoc aequaliter clamant super episcopos et abbates. For those capitularies cf. Thompson, *Middle Ages,* I, 269 and *Economic and Social History of the Middle Ages,* 238.

[34] For the penance of Louis the Pious at Attigny in 822 cf. *Camb. Med. Hist.,* III, 12; at Soissons in 833, *ibid.,* 444. Sommerlad, I, 143: dem Bischoftum . . . die unbestrittene Anerkennung seiner Superiorität. *Camb. Med. Hist.,* III, 444: "Louis the Pious was the king of the priests, but no longer in the same sense as Charles the Great: he was at their mercy."

[35] Thegani, *Vita Hludowici Imp.,* c. 20, *MGH, SS* II, 595: Quia iamdudum illa pessima consuetudo erat, ut ex vilissimis servis fiebant summi pontifices . . . iracundi, rixosi, maliloqui, obstinati, iniuriosi, et minas omnibus subiectis promittentes. Cf. Sommerlad, II, 168, n. 1.

new unity for a failing old one.[36] To be disobeyed by princes themselves incapable of ruling became a matter of vital concern to a "priestly office" conscious of new obligations.[37] "Instead of the apostles I have ordained bishops, that they may govern and instruct thee."[38] Kings such as Charles the Bald hearkened when instructed by such officious and learned advisers as Hincmar,[39] who himself did much to elaborate the episcopal theory of government.[40] The movement involved as well an attempt to get free from the grip of royal influence upon episcopal elections, and Hincmar represents it too in this phase; it is, he says, the evil prompting of the devil that suggests to kings that the ecclesiastical affairs of episcopates are properly in their control.[41] At the same time he recognized the necessity for the loyal attachment of the bishops to the King.[42] Indeed, it was only with the support of this West Frankish episcopate that the Carolingian line was able to perpetuate itself in the west; when the archbishop of Rheims withdrew his support, it was lost.[43]

The bishops of the Rhine and eastwards, on the other hand, seem to have labored more to secure their position as landholders against a threatening feudality than to reach out for control over the East Frankish monarchy.[44] They sought

---

[36] Sommerlad, II, 192, 198-199; *Camb. Med. Hist.*, III, 448; A. M. Koeniger, *Burchard von Worms und die deutsche Kirche seiner Zeit* (1000-1025), 12; Krüger, 37; Hinschius, II, 524.

[37] *Camb. Med. Hist.*, III, 444.

[38] *Ibid.*, 445-446.

[39] *Ibid.*, 447.

[40] *Ibid.*, 447; Thompson, *Middle Ages*, I, 301.

[41] Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, 126, col. 112, letter of Hincmar to Louis III: Sunt qui dicunt, ut audivi, quia res ecclesiasticae episcoporum in vestra sint potestate, ut cuicunque volueritis eas donetis. Quod si ita est, ille malignus spiritus, qui . . . primos parentes nostros perdidit, perditionem vestram in aures vestras susurrat. Cf. Hinschius, II, 528, n. 4.

[42] Migne, 126, col. 110: Regno profícuus et . . . fidelis ac devotus cooperator. Cf. Hinschius, II, 528, n. 4.

[43] *Camb. Med. Hist.*, III, 98; Thompson, *Middle Ages*, I, 318.

[44] Sommerlad, II, 196-198; Hauck, II (1890), 652.

in the king a necessary protection, and when from such a one as Charles the Fat this was not forthcoming, they cooperated in his deposition,[45] led by Liutbert of Mainz.[46] Under Arnulf the intimacy between crown and episcopate was exemplified in the commanding figure of Hatto of Mainz, whose cleverness and treachery became a theme of folk legend.[47] At the synod of Tribur in 895 he was Arnulf's most trustworthy adviser,[48] and continued to exert a great influence in public affairs until his death in 913.[49] Under Louis the Child he was actualiy king.[50] He showed himself also an opponent with the king of the ambitions of the new stem dukes, by the

[45] Thompson, *Feudal Germany*, 22: "The German church, maddened by the tyranny and the exploitation of its lands by a baronage which had riotously pillaged it . . . engineered the deposition of Charles the Fat and the enthronement of Arnulf." Cf. *Camb. Med. Hist.*, III, 62; G. Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, V (1893), 29 ff.

[46] Thompson, *Middle Ages*, I, 298.

[47] The *Mäuseturm* tale had Hatto as one of its subjects, and Adalbert of Babenberg was led to his death by means of a sly ruse of the archbishop. Widukind, I, 22 and cod. A. *MGH, SS* III, 427, relates the story of his designs on Henry of Saxony's life with the golden chain.

[48] *Reginonis Chron.* (895), *MGH, SS* I, 606, concerning the deliberations of the synod of Tribur: contra plerosque seculares, qui auctoritatem episcopalem imminuere tentabant. Cf. Sommerlad, II, 211, and n. 4; Waitz, V, 29 ff. and 31, n. 3; Thompson, *Feudal Germany*, 23 and n. 2; K. W. Nitzsch, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*, I, 352-353. F. Janner, *Geschichte der Bischöfe von Regensburg*, I, 255-267, brings Tuto of Regensburg to the fore as an adviser of Arnulf.

[49] O. Dümmler in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, XI, 26-29. *Contin. Regin.* (912), Kurze, 155: Hatho . . . vir adeo strenuus et prudens. Widukind, I, 22, *MGH, SS* III, 427: acutus consilio, acer ingenio, et qui varietate sibi consueta multos mortales precederet. Regino, *De synod. caus. et discip. eccles. praef.*: Vestra sapientiae supereminens celsitudo in disponendis rebus publicis assidue versatur; cf. Hauck, II, 653, n. 8 and III, 11. *Liudprandi Antapodosis*, II, 6, *MGH, SS* III, 289: Qui ut erat versutie pollens. Cf. Sommerlad, II, 212, n. 5; T. Henner, *Die herzogliche Gewalt der Bischöfe von Würzburg*, 40.

[50] Widukind, I, 22, cod. A, (Kehr, 29): vir magne prudentie, et qui tempore Ludewici adolescentis super imperio Francorum acri cura vigilabat, multas discordias in regno reconciliabat. Ekkehard, *Cas. S. Galli*, IV, *MGH, SS* II, 83: Ipse (Salomo III) et Hatto . . . quem cor regis nominabant . . . post regem imperium tenuerant. Cf. Waitz, V, 34-35 and 35, n. 1.

support he gave Conrad against Henry of Saxony's tendency to extend his holdings into Thuringia,[51] and by his great friendship with that arch-resister to ducal pretensions, Salomo III, the genial bishop of Constance.[52]

This particular manifestation of the feudal spirit in the East Frankish regions, i.e., the rise of the stem duke, is a determining factor in the history of the relationship between bishop and king.[53] It imperils further the already perilous position of the church in the face of the nobility in general. Its unlimited success would preclude a strong monarchy and threaten the more the economic and privileged position of the episcopate. There was even the very real possibility that the episcopate, if it should thus be thrown upon the dukes for the support that it had already won from the king, might instead actually suffer the deprivations of secularization of its property. To the bishop, no whit less feudal in his ambitions than any secular, the figure of a Bavarian Charles Martel in Duke Arnulf was ominous.[54] If therefore three such bishops as Hatto, Salomo and Tuto of Regensburg already betoken an undercurrent of episcopal influence upon the government of King Arnulf, then, after

---

[51] Thompson, *Middle Ages*, I, 371-373; C. Oman, *The Dark Ages* (1929), 476; Hauck, III (1906), 11. Hatto feared for his lands in Saxony and Thuringia, and according to Widukind (I, 22, cod. A, [Kehr, 28-29]) was not able to survive their secularization: Omnia quae erant pontificis . . . Hathonis in omni Saxonia vel Thuringorum terra occupavit . . . Hattho autem videns suis artibus finem impositum Saxonumque res florescere nimia tristicia ac morbo pariter confectus . . . obiit.

[52] Ekkehard, *Cas. S. Galli*, IV, *MGH, SS* II, 92: Hilaris erat et iocundus.

[53] The Liudolfinger power in Saxony derives essentially from the margraviate against Slav and Dane. Likewise the power of the house of Liutpold in Bavaria derives from the margraviate against Bohemian and later Magyar. In Swabia the Burchards were margraves, Erchanger and Berchtold counts palatinate; in Lorraine Regnier was a royal *missus*. Cf. Waitz, V, 35 ff.; A. Meister, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte von den Anfängen bis ins 14. Jahrhundert*, 106-107; Henner, 30-38.

[54] S. Riezler, *Geschichte Baierns*, I, 324-327.

a period of virtual sovereignty under a boy king, and after participating in the election of Conrad as king, they were naturally inclined to support the throne against the threat of the duchies. For his part, the king recognized their support as invaluable.[55] So it is that we find Hatto and Conrad united in opposition to Duke Henry of Saxony.[56] To a man the Bavarian bishops, led by Tuto, supported Conrad against Duke Arnulf, and were well paid for it.[57] Salomo in the Swabian ducal struggle stands out as "the most loyal and most powerful ally of Conrad."[58]

Salomo was abbot of St. Gall as well as bishop of Constance, both of which positions came to him as a result of loyal service at court, beginning as a notary under Charles the Fat and rising to a chancellorship under Louis the Child and Conrad. It is in the rich tradition of St. Gall that the most lively memory of him was preserved. A tall, handsome figure, a smooth talker on any occasion, he came from a family that produced bishops and mothers of bishops as a matter of course.[59] None too ascetic in either point of view or conduct, well cultivated in the arts, with a nice taste in illumination[60] and poetry,[61] he had as abbot displayed also that practical knack of gathering in land, regularizing the

[55] Hauck, III, 9-10; Thompson, *Feudal Germany*, 23-25.

[56] See note 51 above. Cf. Waitz, V, 62 ff.; Hauck, III, 13. Thompson, *Feudal Germany*, 25, explains the absence of a conflict between bishop and duke in Saxony by reference to the poverty of the Saxon church.

[57] Cf. Riezler, I, 319; Janner, I, 283-285. Hauck, III, 12, points to the participation of Heriger of Mainz, and possibly also of Hiltin of Augsburg and Dioto of Würzburg, in the campaign of 916 against Arnulf: Man hat sich in Baiern noch lange dessen erinnert, dass bischöfliche Truppen an der Verwüstung des Landes Anteil nahmen.

[58] Hauck, III, 11. Ekkehard, *Cas. S. Galli*, IV, *MGH, SS* II, 92: Claruerat autem Salomon sub quinque regibus aeque sibi amicis.

[59] Ekkehard, IV, *MGH, SS* II, 92: Erat enim homo praeter decore faciei dotem et stature procere, doctus et disciplinatissimus . . . Dicendi . . . artifex erat. In palatinis et sinodicis eque valens conciliis.

[60] There is an example of his work in *MGH, SS* II, opposite p. 92.

[61] *MGH, Poetae Carolini*, IV, 296, ff.

monastic administration, and supporting its schools, which did much to qualify him for his bishopric. As bishop, too, of one of the wealthiest sees in Germany, he was a suitable object of envy for the Swabian nobility. His light-handed, jocular manner in dealing with them made them detest still more this royal favorite, already the recipient of generous royal grants that diminished their own incomes. There were even rumors of a plot to rob him of his sight. A soldier and a wall-builder, he remained the only Swabian bishop active against the local tendencies.[62] Here was hardly a man that would be inclined to subordinate himself to any duke.[63]

He appears as hostile to both families struggling here for the ducal title, the Burchards and the Erchangers, and he may be said at least to have contributed to the postponement of the victory to a time when he himself had lost favor with a Saxon duke become king. We are told that it was at his instigation that Adalbert, a brother of the Burchard whose first attempt went awry in 911, was done away with,[64] a possible warning to all like-minded aspirants.[65] That there was no love lost between the bishop and the Erchangers is clear from their seizing him and holding him prisoner.[66] To what extent he contributed to the final extermination in 917 of Erchanger, Berchtold and their nephew Liutfrid, must remain a matter only of surmise.[67]

Although it is impossible to show that Salomo took part in the deliberations of the general synod held at Hohenaltheim

---

[62] U. Zeller, *Der Bischof Salomo III von Konstanz.*

[63] Hauck, III, 7.

[64] *Ann. Alam.* (911), *MGH, SS* I, 55: Adalbertus . . . nutu episcopi Salomonis et quorundam aliorum interemptus est.

[65] Zeller, 85-87: Möglich aber auch, dass ihm daran lag, ein für allemal ein blutiges Exempel zu statuieren, um andere von diesem Versuch abzuschrecken.

[66] *Ann. Alam.* (914), *MGH, SS* I, 56: Erchanger hostili manu super episcopum . . . venit et eum comprehendit. *Syn. Alt.*, c. 21, *MGH, LL* II, 558: Insuper et episcopum suum venerabilem Salomonem dolo comprehenderunt.

[67] P. F. Stalin, *Geschichte Württembergs,* I, 126-131; Waitz, V, 57-59; Sommerlad, II, 212; C. J. Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte,* IV, 581; *Allgem. Deut. Biog.*, III, 277-281.

in September 916, it is impossible not to see here the crystallization into synodal decrees of the point of view that he and the German bishops took towards the trend of affairs about them. The synod resented the impossibility of presenting a united front, which the absence of the Saxon bishops prevented.[68] They are come together to consider, among other things, means of "extirpating the devilish growths" that have sprung up, of "checking the execrable intrigues of certain perverse men," and of "purging by elimination."[69] They are concerned with these "holy and inviolable privileges,"[70] with this "property and money," of which they are being robbed,[71] with churches laid waste and burned and bishops assaulted and blinded.[72] These are the things that lead to protestations of loyalty and to pronouncements "in behalf of the strength of our kings" against the violators of sacred oaths.[73] But

---

[68] *Syn. Alt.*, c. 30, *MGH, LL* II, 559.

[69] *Ibid.*, praef., 555: Quatinus aliquo modo diabolica semina in nostris partibus orta extirpare et nefandissimas machinationes quorundam perversorum hominum sedare et eliminando purgare deberet.

[70] *Ibid.*, c. 10, 556: Privilegia . . . intemerata et inviolata.

[71] *Ibid.*, c. 11, 556: Qui Christi et ecclesiae pecunias vel res abstulerit.

[72] *Ibid.*, c. 24, 558: Quisquis per dolum mittit manum suam in . . . episcopum . . . et qui ecclesiam Dei devastat et incendit; c. 29, 559: Ricquinum, qui contra . . . canonum sanctiones Strazburgensem ecclesiam invasit; c. 31, 559: De Einhardo confratre nostro excecato. Nimis horrendum facinus . . .

[73] *Ibid.*, c. 19, 557: Pro robore regum nostrorum . . . Multarum quippe gentium, ut fama est, tanta extat perfidia animorum, ut fidem sacramento promissam suis regibus et dominis servare contemnant, et ore nefario simulent iuramenti professionem, dum retineant mente perfidiae impietatem; c. 24, 558: Et qui periurat et in interitum domni sui regis intendit; c. 20, 557: Item de robore regis. Contestamur . . . ut nemo intendat in interitum regis, nemo vitam principis nece attrectet, nemo regni eum gubernaculis privet, nemo tyrannica presumptione apicem regni sibi usurpet, nemo quolibet machinamento in eius adversitatem sibi coniuratorum manus associet. Quod si in quippiam horum quisquam nostrum temerario ausu praesumptor extiterit, anathemate divino perculsus absque ullo remedii loco habeatur condempnatus aeterno iudicio; c. 23, 558: De eo qui iuramentum regis violat . . . Episcopus . . . si hoc crimen perpetrat, degradetur.

they are not content with mere generalities. They know about whom they are talking: it is Erchanger and his accomplices and allies, who respect neither kings nor bishops—Salomo above all—nor the church. They are to lay down their arms, quit the world, and do penance in a monastery for the rest of their lives.[74] Those, too, "who have been polluted with the madness of Erchanger, Berchtold and Arnulf" shall report to their bishops.[75] If Arnulf and Berchtold do not appear at the next episcopal gathering at Regensburg, let them go to hell.[76] One fairly feels the episcopal wrath burning through the Latin.

This was a protest as futile as it was illogical. It checked in no wise the victory of the duke in Bavaria or Swabia, and the proffer of practical support to the monarchy was taken up with only bland indifference by the ducalized kingship of Henry I. Its illogically consisted in the protest of like against like, of episcopal against ducal feudalism. The incident, however, can be conveniently taken as the terminus of one line of development. It raises an issue and sets the problem. Could the bishop be both feudal and loyalist?[77]

---

[74] *Ibid.*, c. 21, 558: De Erchangario et sociis suis . . . et eius complicibus.

[75] *Ibid.*, c. 34, 559: Ipsi qui polluti fuerant insania Erchangarii, Berhthaldi et Burghardi Arnoldique.

[76] *Ibid.*, c. 35, 559: Sin autem, suadente diabolo, superbe hoc nostrum salubre consilium contempserint . . . anathemate irrevocabili modo dictando et conscribendo eos perpetualiter innodamus, et cum Iuda traditore Dei aeterno igni tradimus cremandos.

[77] Zeller, 97-98; Sommerlad, I, 226-228; Waitz, V, 65-67; Hauck, III, 13-16; Hefele, IV, 581-587; Janner, I, 285-287.

I know of no basis for the statement in *Camb. Med. Hist.*, III, 69, that "Conrad was obliged to have him (Erchanger) arrested for treason at the assembly of Hohen Altheim".

CHAPTER II

A.

EPISCOPAL OPPOSITION TO THE *STATUS QUO*

The German state of the Saxon dynasty was in its inception a compromise between the tradition of empire and the reality of tribal particularism. Henry I, the founder of the dynasty, frankly chose to maintain his position by seeking a *modus vivendi* with his kind, these very dukes so execrated by the bishops. The logic of preceding events demanded that Henry choose between government with or without benefit of bishops. There can be no doubt of the choice that was made, nor of the certitude in the minds of the bishops that it was made: here was a king who was not even consecrated at his coronation by the archbishop of Mainz, which, as Saint Peter explained to Udalrich of Augsburg in a dream, as much as signified a sword without a hilt.[1]

Upon the submission of Arnulf of Bavaria to the crown, the control over the personnel of the Bavarian episcopate[2] was actually turned over to this arch-rebel, *bête noire* of the synod of Hohenaltheim and notorious secularizer of church property.[3] On the surface this looked very much as if the church were to be made to pay the price of peace. Certainly it affords an insight into the character of the ambitions of the dukes, as well as the importance attached to the episcopate.

---

[1] *Vita Oudalrici*, c. 3, *MGH, SS* IV, 389: Dic regi Heinrico, ille ensis qui est sine capulo significat regem qui sine benedictione pontificali regnum tenebit; cf. Sommerlad, II, 229, n. 4.

[2] Thietmar, I, 26 (Kurze, 16): Qui (Arnulf) omnes episcopatus in hiis partibus constitutos sua distribuere manu singularem habuit potestatem. Luidprand, *Antap.*, II, 23, *MGH, SS* III, 293: Quatinus totius Bagoariae pontifices tuae subiaceant dicioni, tueque sit potestati uno defuncto alterum ordinare.

[3] This secularization, partly to strengthen the ducal position, and partly as a measure of defence against the Hungarians, took place in the main between 908 and 914. The Bavarian monasteries suffered far more than the bishoprics. For centuries they kept lists of their stolen property, and Arnulf became anathema to the chroniclers: Riezler,

No matter how bitterly the Bavarian bishops resented this secularization, there is reason to believe that they had foreseen it. Indeed, Arnulf had made it easier for them to reconcile themselves by letting them share in the profits of uprooted monasteries.[4] Deserted now by the crown, they had no choice but to forget their wrathful protestations of 916 and turn for support to the only other possible party willing, in return for their submission, to support a policy already approved by the whole German episcopate, i.e., in this case, the subordination of the monasteries to the bishops. At any rate no loud complaint arose from the Bavarian bishops[5] concerning this new position. They met in their own gatherings without participating in the ecclesiastical gatherings of the whole realm. Odalbert of Salzburg was in Arnulf's army in Italy in 934. The duke exercised supervision over the property of the church, and Henry I himself did not bother to come to Bavaria except on one occasion, on the way to Bohemia.[6]

Geschichte Baierns, I, 324-327; Hauck, III, 9. Tegernsee claimed to have lost out of 11,866 manors all but 114: S. Hirsch, *JB H II*, 94, n. 3. Udalrich of Augsburg saw the fate of Arnulf in a dream in which he was brought to the plain of the Lechfeld: *Vita Oudalrici*, c. 3, *MGH, SS* IV, 388-389: Ibi enim sanctum Petrum . . . invenit cum multitudine magna episcoporum et aliorum sanctorum . . . synodale conloquium cum eis facientem . . . Arnolfumque ducem Bawariorum . . . de destructione multorum monasteriorum, quae in beneficia laicorum divisit, de multis sanctis accusatum, legaliter iudicantem. For similar references to Arnulf cf. Waitz, *JB H I*, 56, n. 6 and excursus, No. 12.

[4] Riezler, I, 330-335, points out that at this time Wörth went to Regensburg, Tegernbach to Freising, and Kremsmünster, St. Florian and St. Pölten to Passau. Drakolf of Freising undertook so thorough a plundering of the monasteries of Schäftlarn, Moosburg and Isen, which he controlled, that monastic life ceased in these centers. Later bishops of Trent and Passau possessed Tegernsee property. Janner, I, 282-294, makes some objection to Riezler's position, but not enough to vitiate its general acceptability.

[5] Hauck, III, 27: Nicht einmal in Baiern hören wir, dass sie Widerspruch gegen Arnulfs Gewalt erhoben. Waitz, *JB H I*, 55-56.

[6] Hauck, III, 18-19; Riezler, I, 335; Janner, I, 294; Meister, 108-109.

With the remaining dukes the king was not obliged to go so far. And yet, although to Burchard of Swabia he did not abandon control over the makeup of the episcopate,[7] here too peace was made with a declared enemy of the bishops, and one who was not over scrupulous in his attitude toward the sanctity of church holdings. In fact, he later came to be put in the same class with Arnulf, as church historians turned their minds back to his day.[8] With Eberhard of Franconia Henry came to terms on the basis of mutual recognition of the position of each.[9] Saxony he kept in his own hands.[10]

We find no more reason to doubt that Henry I deliberately chose to try to govern without benefit of clergy, if we inquire into the rôle of the bishops in public affairs during his reign or into his generosity to them. Between Salomo of Constance and the splendid line of bishops who are to crowd the political horizon from the reign of Otto I on, there is no commanding figure. That this was a result of policy, as well as of the uncertainty into which the episcopate was thrown by the new turn of affairs, can not be doubted. The bishops had simply lost their political importance.[11] Nor is there any pronounced evidence to show that Henry felt obliged to

[7] There is a possibility that Burchard was left a right of presentation to episcopal sees. At least Udalrich of Augsburg came of this ducal family: Stälin, I, 174; Waitz, *JB H I*, 43-45; Sommerlad, II, 230-232.

[8] *Vita S. Wiboradae*, c. 25, *MGH, SS* IV, 453: Tyrannus . . . Burchardus, non dux sed predator et desolator istius provinciae . . . Loca et predia circumquaque a fidelibus mihi collata predavit et sibi cooperantibus in beneficium tradidit. *Miracula S. Verenae*, c. 1, *MGH, SS* IV, 457: Copiosam multitudinem militum sibi sociavit, quibus non solum suas verum etiam aecclesiasticas possessiones . . . in beneficia donavit. Ekkehard, *Cas. S. Galli*, c. 3, *MGH, SS* II, 104: Purchardus . . . Sueviam quasi tyrannice regens, praestationes Engilbertum abbatem primo militibus suis petivit. Waitz, *JB H I*, 44, nn. 4 and 5.

[9] Hauck, III, 17.

[10] Meister, 107.

[11] Hauck, III, 17 and 27 resp.: Am Hofe keines andern Königs waren die Bischöfe so einflusslos wie an dem Heinrichs . . . So lange Heinrich regiert hat . . . der deutsche Episkopat sich politisch untätig verhalten.

assist either the secular or regular branches of the church in Germany in increasing their property holdings. On the contrary, at any rate as compared with his predecessors or his successors, he may even be said to have been somewhat niggardly.[12] It would be inaccurate, however, to suggest that there was no contact between the episcopate and the crown, or that an embittered hostility reigned between them. With the exception of Bavaria, Henry maintained the royal hold on the membership of the episcopate and kept on reasonably good terms with the bishops. If their influence was diminished, it would be difficult to point to a correspondingly increased influence of the secular nobility on the government.[13]

Henry's solution of the problem of king and duke and bishop was not to prove permanent for the simple reason

---

[12] The number of grants to bishops and monasteries from later German Carolingians between 814 and 911 is given by Hauck, III, 57, as 149. Thompson's statement, *Feudal Germany*, 20, that the number applies to bishops alone is incorrect according to the Hauck citation. The close relations between King Arnulf and the church are illustrated by the granting of 40 charters in 888 and 31 in 889, to both bishops and abbots (Thompson, *op. cit.*, 23, n. 2). Of the 38 grants from the eight years of Conrad I's reign, all but one are for clergy or clerical institutions (Sommerlad, II, 228). From the 17 years of Henry I's rule only 41 authentic documents are preserved. Of these 35 are for bishops or abbots or their foundations, and 11 contain new grants. Clergy intercede in the documents but 21 times compared with 30 times for seculars. (F. Seelig, *Verleihungen Ottos I an Bistümer und Klöster und deren Zusammenhang mit der Politik des Königs und Kaisers*, 1-4). Hauck, III, 17, states that in the charters of Henry I only seven bishops are named as intercessors, and of these only two are named twice, and that only two bishoprics are granted increases in property. Cf. Sommerlad, II, 232-234. My own analysis of these documents as listed in Böhmer-Ottenthal, *Die Regesten des Kaiserreichs unter den Herrschern aus dem Sächsischen Hause, 919-1024*, shows 35 ecclesiastical charters, 24 to monasteries and 11 to bishoprics. The majority are confirmations of existing privileges. The whole matter would seem to call for a very rigid investigation, which might result in some modification of the above statement of Henry's policy.

[13] Bishops most prominent in grants and in synods and *Reichstage* are Heriger and Hildebert of Mainz, Adalward of Verden, Unwan of Paderborn, Unni of Hamburg-Bremen, Richwin of Strassburg, Dodo of

that it did not work. Never was the Saxon house able to assert itself so strongly that there was not danger to its security or to its succession from a discontented party of nobles, headed usually by the dukes, and supported always by a considerable element in the episcopate. The first few years of Otto I's reign were filled with this sort of rebellion, and his experience with it led to stronger methods in dealing with the duchies. After the campaigns against Eberhard of Bavaria the duchy went to his uncle, but on less favorable terms as regards the control of the episcopate.[14] Immediately Otto was faced with a revolt of Eberhard of Franconia, joined soon by Thankmar, Otto's half-brother and a disappointed office seeker. By 939 the situation was very dangerous. Henry, Otto's brother, joined hands with his brother-in-law, Giselbert of Lorraine, a combination made all the more formidable when Eberhard of Franconia joined it too. The death of Eberhard in the struggle resulted in Franconia's being kept in royal hands without a duke. Here we see a disposition on Otto's part to refuse to recognize any hereditary principle in the succession to duchies, but to make the duke a royal appointee, either a member of the royal family or at least a royal adherent, or else to keep them in his own hands.[15]

One must note that bishops were active in this whole sub-

Osnabrück, Noting of Constance, Ruotbert of Trier, Udalrich of Augsburg and Balderich of Utrecht. Richter-Kohl, *Annalen des deutschen Reichs im Zeitalter der Ottonen und Salier*, I, 13 and n. to year 927; Hefele, IV, 590-591; Böhmer-Ottenthal, II, 1, 7-8; Waitz, *JB H I*, 89, 106-107. The notable grant to bishop Gauzlin of Toul in 927 is made: ob . . . pontificis dilectionem quem erga nostram serenitatem noveramus promptissimum (*MGH, DD* I, 52, No. 16); Böhmer-Ottenthal, II, 1, 16. Georg V. Below, *Die italienische Kaiserpolitik des deutschen Mittelalters*, p. 20, remarks: Die sog. "ottonische" Politik beginnt schon unter Heinrich I.

[14] Thietmar, I, 26, (Kurze, 16): Non successoribus suis tantum reliquit honorem (i.e. omnes episcopatus in his partibus constitutos sua distribuere manu); Dümmler, *Otto der Grosse*, 79; Richter-Kohl, 35-36.

[15] Riezler, I, 337; Meister, 107-108; Stälin, I, 174 ff.

versive movement.[16] Giselbert was supported by the bishops of Upper Lorraine, Adalbero of Metz,[17] Bernain of Verdun, both from powerful noble families of the region, and Gauzlin of Toul, whom Henry I had loved for his constant readiness for royal service. Gauzlin's change of sentiment is especially important to illustrate the possible fear that a bishop might feel of the development of a strong monarchy. There was, too, Rothard of Strassburg, and, finally, the enigmatic figure of Frederick of Mainz, who from now on until his death in 954 was associated with every important rebellion in the land. The chronicler sums him up in a final judgment: "In this only did he seem reprehensible, that, wherever so much as one person appeared as an enemy of the king, he immediately joined him as a second." [18] Upon the collapse of the rebellion Rothard of Strassburg was sent to Corvey.[19] Frederick was arrested and sent somewhere in Saxony.[20] When Henry,

[16] *Cont. Reg.*, 939 (Kurze, 160): Sed et quidam ecclesiastici viri nequam et Deo odibiles cum illis factione concordant omniaque passim pacis et concordiae iura turbabant.

[17] The only bishop resisting Otto after the failure of 939. *Ibid.*, 161: Omnibus tamen Lothariensibus subactis aliquamdiu resistere conatus est episcopus Mittensis. Adalbero was the son of a *Pfalzgraf*, of a family which was related to the Carolingians; Dümmler, 95.

[18] *Cont. Reg.*, 954 (Kurze, 168). In hoc tantum videbatur reprehensibilis quod, sicubi vel unus regis inimicus emersit, ipse se statim secundum apposuit.

[19] *Cont. Reg.*, 939 (Kurze, 161): Ruodhardus . . . Corbeiae monasterio destinatur; Widukind, II, 25 (Kehr, 75).

[20] This is Liudprand's statement (*Antap.*, IV, 32, *MGH, SS* III, 326: ut custodiae sit in Saxonia traditus), which seems to be all we can be sure of. Widukind (II, 25, Kehr, 75) says: In Hammaburgensem civitatem quasi in exilium destinavit, which Kehr, comparing the manuscripts, thinks there is no doubt is what Widukind wrote and means Hamburg, whereas in *Cont. Reg.* for the same year, 939, we read (Kurze, 161): Fridericus ad Fuldam monasterium mittitur.

Kehr discusses (p. 75, n. 4) (referring also to the source of the statement that Frederick was sent to Hammelburg, a property of Fulda) the contradiction between Widukind and the author of *Cont. Reg.*, who he thinks has confused this with another relegation of Frederick, which Widukind himself refers to later (II, 38, Kehr, 83), when he remarks that Hadumar, the loyal abbot of Fulda, found by experi-

Otto's brother, rebelled again in 941,[21] Frederick's conduct was again so suspicious that he was obliged to exculpate himself publicly.[22]

ence that Frederick would bear close watching: Hic pontificem sub custodia tenuit, secunda coniuratione culpabilem, primum honorifice, sed, cum litteras ab eo scriptas reprehendisset, satis severe.

Just exactly the rôle played by Frederick is not altogether clear. In 938 he was used as a mediator between Otto I and Eberhard of Franconia (Widukind, II, 13 [Kehr, 66]), and Otto used him again before Breisach to enter upon negotiations with the rebels: Widukind, II, 25 (Kehr, 75): Summus pontifex missus ad Evurhardum pro concordia et pace. Frederick's negotiations were highly unsatisfactory: *Ibid.*: Rex autem . . . nil ad se pertinere voluit, quicquid episcopus egisset sine suo imperio. It is at this point that Frederick broke with the king, leading the other bishops in the camp along with him, each to go his own way, and Frederick evidently to go to Metz to join the rebels according to an agreed upon plan: *Cont. Reg.*, 939 (Kurze, 160-161); Widukind, II, 24 (Kehr, 74); Liudprand, *Antap.*, IV, 27, *MGH, SS* III. 324, IV, 31, 326. Otto's victory at Andernach, with the deaths of Giselbert and Eberhard, prevented this reunion, and brought the revolt to a stop. Liudprand reports that out of fear of the king the citizens of Mainz refused to let Frederick into the city, and that this resulted in his capture and imprisonment: *Antap.*, IV, 32, 326. Cf. Nitzsch, I, 326; Richter-Kohl, 36-37.

[21] It may be the events of this year that Widukind has in mind when he speaks of *secunda coniuratione* in the passage quoted in the second paragraph of n. 20; unhappily he does not make clear the exact time that he has in mind.

Whenever it may have been that Frederick was relegated to Fulda, where there can hardly be any doubt that he was at some time, it is interesting to note that he did not enjoy his confinement with a group of rule-breaking monks. For all his restive independence, he was at the same time a religious zealot, and when he left Fulda he sought his revenge by seeking to have the community reformed, but without success: Widukind, II, 38 (Kehr, 83): Pontifex . . . dimissus dum ultionem quaerit . . . Nam abbas in gratia et amicitia regis permansit et causis intercurrentibus pontifex quod cogitavit non implevit.

[22] *Cont. Reg.*, 941 (Kurze, 162): Fridericus . . . quia conspirationis huius particeps videbatur, publica se examinatione, preceptione corporis et sanguinis Domini, coram populo in ecclesia purgavit. Cf. Dümmler, 116-118; W. Wattenbach, *Über Widukind von Corvey und die Erzbischöfe von Mainz*, SBBA, 1896, I. T. F. Tout's statement (*Empire and Papacy*, 19-20), "But before long he joined with the archbishop of Mainz in a plot to murder the king", is somewhat misleading and too positive.

In the revolt of 953, when almost the whole German nobility fell away from the crown, although Otto I's brother Bruno, who became archbishop of Cologne when the struggle was at its height,[23] and Udalrich, bishop of Augsburg, emerge as staunch supporters of the royal cause, yet their prestige was offset by two opposing archbishops, the one Harold of Salzburg, the other again Frederick of Mainz, the foremost representative of the church in Germany, both supporting a rebellion that enlisted the aid of the pagan Hungarians.[24] Frederick's understanding with Liudolf of Swabia and Conrad of Lorraine was a matter of some months' standing when the revolt broke out in Lent of 953.[25] Frederick seems to have taken a less active part in events than was the case in 939, preferring, as was certainly thought by Otto and many contemporaries, to abandon even his see and to cloak his association with the rebels by withdrawing for the summer to Breisach.[26] At the Fritzlar assembly in May, however, he was censured by Henry, Otto I's brother, now duke

---

[23] For Bruno and Lorraine in this revolt, see Chap. III.

[24] Nitzsch, I, 347: Gerade die Kirche, an deren Erhebung er arbeitete, hatte ihn in dieser Bewegung im Stich gelassen; ihr ester Vertreter, der Mainzer Metropolit, war sofort und mit aller Entschiedenheit auf die Seite seiner Gegner getreten. Is it not somewhat inaccurate, as Thompson does in *The Middle Ages*, 380-381, to speak of three separate revolts, and of the third as "instigated by Frederick of Mainz?"

[25] Liudolf entertained Frederick at Saalfeld, Christmas, 952: *Cont. Reg.*, 952 (Kurze, 165): Quod convivium iam multis suspitiosum coepit haberi, et plus ibi destructionis quam utilitatis ferebatur tractari; later: Fridericus . . . et Cuonradus dux amici facti sunt.

[26] Ruotger makes Otto say to Bruno of Frederick, *Vita Brunonis*, c. 20 (Pertz, 21): Dicent fortasse bellis haec sedanda esse, quae ad te non pertineant, quae tui minysterii dignitatem non deceant. Huiusmodi fraudulenta verborum iactantia istius metropolis praesul, vides quantos seduxit, quantos ad civilis cladis rabiem illexit; qui si subducere se vellet a dissensione, quemadmodum fingit, et bellorum periculo, ut religioso degere posset in otio, nobis profecto et nostrae rei publicae melius id, quod ei regali munificentia contulimus, reddidisset quam hostibus. *Cont. Reg.*, 953 (Kurze, 167): Brisacam castellum, latibulum semper Deo regique rebellantium.

of Bavaria, and generally held guilty by those present.[27] Before turning over Mainz to Liudolf and Conrad, thus making it the chief seat of the revolt,[28] he had delayed Otto's entrance into it,[29] and then arranged what amounted to a forced agreement between the king and his rebellious kinsmen, which Otto repudiated after leaving Mainz.

Otto abandoned a later two months' siege of "rich and noble" Mainz,[30] to turn his attention to the situation in Bavaria, whither the revolt had spread, and where it was headed by the *Pfalzgraf* Arnulf, a son of the sinner of Hohenaltheim, and Harold of Salzburg, an Ottonian appointee, archchaplain and archchancellor of the realm for Bavaria,[31] he,

---

[27] Widukind, III, 16, (Kehr, 95): Heinricus . . . multas ac graves causas summo pontifici obiciebat; proptereaque regis totiusque pene exercitus offensam incurrit, dum eum penitus culpabilem ex illius dictis censerent.

[28] *Cont. Reg.*, 953 (Kurze, 167): Fridericus . . . Mogontia secessit et civitatem inimicis regis tuendam commisit.

[29] *Ibid.*, 166: Ubi (Mainz) aliter quam regem decebat diutius ante portas expectans, Friderico . . . iam cum illis conspirante vix urbis ingressum obtinuit.

[30] Ruotger, *Vita Brunonis*, c. 16 (Pertz, 16): Ea tempestate ab imperatore et exercitu eius obsessa est Magontia, urbs nobilis et opulenta. Erat enim referta hostibus et insidiatoribus regni.

[31] Early in the revolt Harold was a royalist, and profited thereby in December 953 by a gift of property of the *Pfalzgraf's* son Henry. When the revolt continued after the *Pfalzgraf's* death, Harold, probably for family reasons, joined it. When the Bavarian revolt proper was crushed by Duke Henry in 955, Harold was taken prisoner and blinded by the duke: *Cont. Reg.*, 954 (Kurze, 167). He was exiled to Seben, and a good deal of the property of his church probably went to Henry's soldiers. But this independent spirit, whose sight is was necessary to destroy in order to get a loyal archbishop in at Salzburg, kept just this thing from happening for four more years by refusing to give up his dignity. When his successor, Frederick, finally obtained Salzburg, this blind bishop continued to exercise the spiritual functions of his office. It was necessary to bring the embarrassing situation to the attention of Pope John XII, who, in 962, threatened Harold with excommunication should he not desist. But he did not desist, for five years later, in 967, John XIII at the Synod of Ravenna wrote a letter to all archbishops and bishops, which was signed also by the Emperor Otto and 59 arch-

too, with blood of the old duke Arnulf in his veins. They were supported off and on by the Bavarian episcopate.[32] At the moment the military struggle centered about Regensburg, which the rebels had taken. In Swabia Otto had very little support indeed outside of what bishop Udalrich of Augsburg could furnish.[33] But there was little time to lose. Udalrich, who was no less active in Otto's behalf than certain of his episcopal colleagues were in opposition, abandoning his customary travelling wagon, jumped on a horse and with his vassals rode to the aid of the king, leaving behind a few of his men for the defense of Augsburg.[34] He paid dearly for his somewhat prolonged service in the king's behalf, for both the Bavarian Arnulf and Liudolf took advantage of the defenceless condition of Augsburg in the absence of its bishop to plunder it mercilessly.[35] Under these con-

---

bishops and bishops, accusing him: ecclesias dei exspoliaverit, thesaurum paganis erogaverit, seseque eis iunxerit in christianorum necem et depraedationem, contra dominium et piissimum imperatorem suum seniorem rebellis et infidelis extiterit (quoted by Dümmler, 248, n. 1). There can be little doubt where the emphasis is to be placed in this accusation. This blind flouter of a duke, an emperor and a pope, about whom we know too little, died in this same year, 967. H. Widmann, *Geschichte Salzburgs*, I, 154-158; Dümmler, 248-249; Richter-Kohl, 76; Hauck, III, 39-40; Hirsch, *JB H II*, I, 42; Riezler, I, 387-388.

[32] Widukind, III, 27 (Kehr, 99): Non minima quoque caeteris pontificibus cunctatio erat in Boioaria, dum favent partibus, nunc regi assistendo, nunc alienas partes adiuvando, quia nec sine periculo alienabantur a rege nec sine sui detrimento ei adhaerebant; cf. Dümmler, 224; Hirsch, I, 42.

[33] *Vita Oudalrici*, c. 10, *MGH, SS* IV, 399: Oudalricus cuius fidelitatis firma stabilitas numquam ab adiutorio regis separata est. . . . Eo tempore in tota regione Suevorum nullus in regis adiutorio remanebat nisi Adalpertus comes cum sibi subditis et Dietpaldus frater religiosi episcopi.

[34] *Ibid.*: Omisso vehiculo carpenti equitando in servicium regis.

[35] *Ibid.*: Arnolfus . . . Augustam adiit, et despoliavit omnibus rebus quas secum abducere potuit, comprehensosque quosdam milites episcopi secum Bawariam revexit . . . totum episcopatum pene in beneficium extraneorum dividebatur a Liutolfo et sequacibus eius, milites autem episcopi, quidam comprehensi, quidam vero sollicitatione iniqua ab eo

ditions, and after the failure of the siege of Regensburg, Udalrich did not dare to undertake the defense of poorly fortified Augsburg.[36] Rather he encouraged his men to take up a strong position in the abandoned fort at Swabmünchen,[37] and now in the midst of a hard winter, with attack imminent, to put the place in defensible shape. Living for the time being in temporary quarters, supervising this restoration, he had at the same time to ward off attack by the use of clever diplomacy, until all was ready.[38] When he could no longer hide these preparations, he tried at the last moment to buy off the attack and to keep his hostile parishioners from destroying the property of the episcopate.[39] But when the attack came, with the assistance of his brother and Count Adalbert the enemy was completely confounded. It was the first notable success of the royal party. The bishop could return to Augsburg and come to terms with those who thought best to return the stolen property.[40] We are informed that those who did not suffered exemplary punishments.

The revolt terminated with protestations by Frederick of Mainz of his innocence, and with the mediation of Udalrich and Hartbert of Chur. At Langenzenn Conrad submitted and Frederick was finally reconciled with Otto and even at-

---

divisi, quidam depraedationibus in pauperiem deducti, ita ut ei secundum suam voluntatem in adiutorio esse non potuissent.

[36] *Ibid.*, c. 12, 401: Tunc imis sine turribus circumdata muris firma ex semet ipsa non fuit.

[37] *Ibid.*, c. 10, 399: Quod erat in toto interius exteriusque sine aedificiis desertum.

[38] *Ibid.*: Quamvis certe hiemps dura fuisset, tamen in illo loco in tabernaculis et in tuguriis festinanter compositis expectavere, donec congregata familia castellum ligno circumcinxere, et intus secundum possibilitatem eorum aedificia apta composuere . . . diversis promissionibus et humillimis responsionibus . . . obsidibus datis . . . eorum iras et invasiones omni modo mitigavit, donec aedificato castello vallisque renovatis in munitione eiusdem loci . . . se posse defendere aestimarent.

[39] *Ibid.*: Multa pecunia promissa . . . suos parrochianos constringere ne loca . . . in suo episcopatu sita ullo modo invadere praesumerent.

[40] *Ibid.*, c. 11, 400; Dümmler, 228 ff.; Richter-Kohl, 71.

tempted to win over Liudolf to terms.[41] The latter finally succumbed to the peace efforts of Udalrich of Augsburg and Hartbert of Chur at Illertissen, and in December 954 at Arnstadt, with sturdy Frederick of Mainz gone, a peace could be celebrated that deprived these two dukes of their

[41] Widukind, III, 32 (Kehr, 101): Pontifex . . . promittens se . . . iudicio significaturum numquam contra regem sensisse vel velle vel fecisse; timore coactum a rege discessisse, offensum . . . innocentem . . . de caetero iuramentorum omnibus argumentis fidem servaturum. Ad haec rex: A vobis non exigo iuramentum, nisi pacis et concordiae consilium, in quantum possitis, adiuvetis. Cf. *Cont. Reg.*, 954 (Kurze, 168). For mediation with Liudolf: Widukind, III, 33, (Kehr, 102). A final interpretative judgment concerning Frederick of Mainz seems impossible in the face of the inability or unwillingness of those who first report about him to come to any definite conclusion. They prefer the easier method of letting God decide: Widukind, III, 15, (Kehr, 95): De eo nostrum arbitramur nequaquam aliquid temere iudicare . . . de accusatis causis qui iudicat Dominus est; Ruotgeri, *Vita Brunonis*, c. 16 (Pertz, 16): De archiepiscopo loci varius principum aeque et vulgi sermo fuit: alii innocentiam eius in coelum ferre . . . quippe partes eum execrari testabantur. . . . Nos interim haec Dei iudicio relinquamus. Modern scholarship is somewhat distrustful of this method. Hauck, III, 34-39, chose to regard him as a martyr to the cause of the non-secularized bishop, one of the last German bishops who tried to withdraw himself from the political mesh. Dümmler, 240 ff., regarded him as a riddle: Ein Mann fur dessen Bestrebungen uns der Schlüssel fehlt. Wattenbach, *op. cit.*, 344-352, rejecting Hauck's interpretation with the remark attributed to Otto by Ruotger (*Vita Brunonis*, c. 20), that for a man who would avoid political life suspected complicity in every subversive movement against the *status quo* was a questionable mode of procedure, assumes that he is a Franconian, and then proceeds to interpret his activity as that of a loyal adherent of his duchy, who resents Saxon domination and would return to the good old episcopal days of Conrad. Speaking of Frederick he says (p. 344): Solche zugleich asketische und ehrgeizige, herrschbegierige Pfaffen waren zahlreich. I venture to suggest, in the light of the process of feudalization that was transforming Germany, that here was a man caught between the two political currents, inclined more to the support of what was a particularistic movement, but at the same time unable not to see the advantages of a stronger monarchy and unwilling to see the subversive tendencies go to the limit of complete disruption. He cannot be said to have been a mainstay of the crown, nor did anyone think he was uninterested in politics. But he was not sure that the feudal tendencies

duchies and provided for a more suitable successor to Frederick.[42]

Episcopal support was to be had likewise for the revolt of the Henries of Bavaria against Otto II, a revolt tied up also with the resistance of the Slavs on the eastern frontier.[43] In the first phase of this difficulty, in the midst of an otherwise loyal episcopate, the shrewd bishop Abraham of Freising was definitely one of the chief abettors of the ambitions of the young duke Henry.[44] He was sent for a while in arrest to Corvey.[45] In the second phase of the revolt, Henry, bishop of Augsburg, a nephew of Judith, regent for her son Henry, supported his cousin and Henry of Carinthia. There were plans to cooperate with the Bavarian insurgents in holding

---

were not the safest for the state, for all independent spirits, including himself, and for the chuch, including the archiepiscopal see of Mainz. If he did not support Otto, he could not resist his efforts to restore peace when it became apparent that his real political convictions were unlikely to prevail. And it certainly is significant that upon his death, October 25, 954, Mainz was turned over to Otto's bastard son William, and the final reconciliation at Arnstadt could be enthusiastically celebrated in the presence of Bruno, Otto's brother, archbishop of Cologne and administrator of Lorraine.

[42] *Vita Oudalrici*, c. 12, *MGH*, *SS* IV, 401. F. Hartz, *Das rheinische Herzogtum unter den Ottonen in politischer Hinsicht, 915-1002*, 42-47; C. Hegel, *Verfassungsgeschichte von Mainz im Mittelalter*, 14; Stälin, I, 179-183; Sommerlad, II, 256; Dümmler, 215-243; Richter-Kohl, 63 ff.

[43] Thompson, *The Middle Ages*, I, 385.

[44] Uhlirz, *JB O II*, 53-54: Nicht ohne Grund dürfte man ihn als einen Fortsetzer der Politik des Erzbischofs Friedrich von Mainz betrachten. Abraham had been the chief adviser of the beautiful (egregiae formae, Widukind, II, 36, [Waitz, 53]) young mother of Henry, Judith, who acted as regent, and in fact lived on such terms of intimacy with her that there arose scandalous talk, which Abraham undertook publicly to quiet at her funeral, insisting upon her innocence and calling down damnation on himself if he were guilty of misconduct. Thietmar, II, 41, (Kurze, 44): Haec (Judith) in viduitate sua continenter vivens cum Habraham . . . pre caeteris diligeret, invido vulgari dente admodum inculpabilis dilaniebatur.

[45] Cf. Hirsch, *JB H II*, 50, n. 4; Riezler, I, 357 ff.; Janner, I, 382-385; Hirsch, *JB H II*, I, 49-51; Uhlirz, *JB O II*, 51-54, 78-79; Dümmler, 295; Richter-Kohl, 122-125.

Passau. The bishop led the loyal duke Otto of Swabia to believe that he would furnish his contingents for a campaign against Bohemia, but instead took advantage of Otto's departure for Bohemia to seize his family holdings.[46] Bishop Henry did not, however, reach Passau, but was sent into custody at Verden,[47] while Henry of Bavaria was sent to bishop Folcmar at Utrecht.

The complicated struggle over the regency for Otto III, which turned out to be an attempt of Henry of Bavaria to get the throne, can therefore be regarded as one more in the list of feudal revolts against the Saxon dynasty. The forces supporting Henry were to a large extent episcopal.[48] After his release from his four year custody under Folcmar (Poppo) of Utrecht,[49] by whom he was supported,[50] he ultimately secured the person of the young Otto III from the legal regent, archbishop Warin of Cologne, by whom he was also supported.[51] Three additional archbishops favored Henry, Giseler of Magdeburg,[52] Egbert of Trier [53] and Fred-

---

[46] *Vita Oudalrici*, c. 28, *MGH, SS* IV, 416: Cum Heinricus episcopus ire se cum illo (Otto) promitteret, exspectavit cum suis militibus, donec recederet exercitus, et sicut antea conciliati sunt, occupavit cum militibus suis civitates quas potuit, et ipse in Novunburc (Neuburg) intravit.

[47] *Ibid.;* Uhlrz, *JB O II*, 82, 94, 103; Richter-Kohl, 127.

[48] Wilmans, *JB O III*, 14-24: Vorzugsweise die Bischöfe auf seiner Seite. In Germany proper only Willigis, archbishop of Mainz, the *maiestas vestra* of Adalbero of Rheims, can be said to have played a leading part in support of Theophano and Otto III. E. E. Schmidt, *Gisilher, Bischof von Merseburg, Erzbischof von Magdeburg*, 44, n. 16.

[49] Thompson, *The Middle Ages*, I, 386, speaks of an escape from Utrecht "with the connivance of Poppo, Archbishop of Cologne". As Warin was archbishop of Cologne at the time, the reference must be to Folcmar (Poppo) of Utrecht.

[50] Thietmar, IV, 3 (Kurze, 66): Popponem misit episcopum, ut adversantes sibi disiungere [vel] reconciliari temptaret.

[51] Wilmans, *JB O III*, 3-5.

[52] Thietmar, IV, 7 (Kurze, 68): Gisillerum huc misit archiepiscopum, qui voluntatem eorum perquireret pacemque, si potuisset . . . firmaret. Cf. Schmidt, 43-45.

[53] Wilmans, *JB O III*, 33.

erick of Salzburg.[54] In addition, the remaining Bavarian bishops and the intractable Dietrich of Metz looked with disfavor upon the regency of an alien woman whose opinion of German courage was reported to be none too high.[55]

Finally, upon the insurrectionary movements in Saxony at the end of Otto III's reign the Saxon bishops also looked with tolerance.[56] Certainly in the succeeding tripartite struggle for the crown there can be said to have been no common episcopal support of the Saxon dynasty.[57] The bishops participated in the movements within their respective duchies and were open to negotiation.[58] Herman of Swabia was supported by Giseler of Magdeburg [59] and forced Landbert of Constance and Othelrich of Chur to aid him.[60] Arnulf

---

[54] Thietmar, IV, 4 (Kurze, 66): Dux autem conversis ad se omnibus Bawariorum episcopis.

[55] Cf. Wilmans, *JB O III*, 5-6. Also, for the whole struggle, Böhmer, *Willigis von Mainz. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des deutschen Reichs und der deutschen Kirche in der Sächsischen Kaiserzeit*, 26-40; Nitzsch, I, 369-370; Janner, 400-402; Richter-Kohl, 141-143.

[56] Thietmar, IV, 49 (Kurze, 91): Namque nostri duces et comites non sine conscientia episcoporum multa contra eum conspirare nituntur.

[57] Nitzsch, I, 385-386.

[58] E.g. Willigis in re Gandersheim, Böhmer, 105 ff.; Burchard, looking for support in getting rid of the Konradinerburg: *Vita Burchardi*, c. 9, *MGH SS* IV, 836: Heinricus Bavarorum dux . . . Wormaciam venit et ut sceptra regni acquireret, non modicum laboravit. . . . Deinde omnia quae voluissent (bishop of Worms and archbishop of Mainz), si voluntati consentirent, se facturum promisit. Promiserat enim se munitam domum Ottonis acquisiturum et in potestatem episcopi Wormaciensis redditurum; sicque multa dando et promittendo ad voluntatem sententiae suae hos viros perduxit; and the Franconian bishops, Nitzsch, *loc. cit.*; Boos, I, 242.

[59] Thietmar, V, 39 (Kurze, 129): Hunc (Giseler) primo propter Herimannum, quem sibi idem semper in regno summopere conatur preponere, odivit (Henry II).

[60] *Ibid.*, V, 13 (Kurze, 114): Namque eiusdam civitatis (Constance) episcopus. . . . Lanbertus cum Curiensi pastore Othelrico Herimannum auxiliabatur, non tamen ex animo. Adalbold, *Vita Heinrici* II, *MGH, SS* IV, 685: Cum Herimanno erant, non tantum illum ex corde ad regnum eligentes quantum vicinitatem eius timentes et de termino litigii dubitantes. Hirsch, *JB H II*, 219, n. 3.

of Halberstadt and the cultivated Bernward of Hildesheim sympathized early with the ambitions of Ekkehard, margrave of Meissen, and Rethar of Paderborn at least treated him politely.[61] Heribert of Cologne, by trying to thwart Henry's attempt to secure the imperial insignia and then supporting Herman of Swabia, inaugurated the bad relations with him that lasted for almost the duration of his reign.[62] Bruno of Augsburg, Henry II's brother, was associated with the revolt of the margrave Henry of Schweinfurt, and was later exiled by Henry II himself.[63] Henry of Würzburg was allied with Henry II's Italian enemies in 1017 and, in fact, after the creation of the see of Bamberg was never on very friendly terms with the king.[64]

B.

EPISCOPAL INDEPENDENCE AND ECCLESIASTICAL POLICY

If the bishop was capable of maintaining his own point of view to the extent of joining a rebellion against the king, no less was he insistent upon upholding his interests in the face of ecclesiastical plans of the crown or in the face of another bishop, whether a fellow German bishop or the bishop of Rome. The manipulation of the sees of Magdeburg and Merseburg, the foundation of Bamberg, the dispute over the abbey of Gandersheim, and Count Otto of Hammerstein's defiance of both bishop and emperor, are, from another point of view, illustrations as significant as any of the stubborn, individualistic episcopate, and therefore perhaps worth going into in some detail.

One of the cardinal features of Otto I's northeastern frontier policy was the erection of a new archbishopric at Mag-

---

[61] Thietmar, *Chron.*, V, 4-5 (Kurze, 109).

[62] *Ibid.*, IV, 50 (Kurze, 92); Hirsch, *JB H II*, 1, 194-227; Richter-Kohl, 172-173; Stälin, I, 196-197.

[63] Thietmar, *Chron.*, V, 38 (Kurze, 128); Hirsch, *JB H II*, II, 5.

[64] Hirsch, *JB H II*, IV, 107-109.

deburg. His original plan was to transfer the bishopric of Halberstadt to Magdeburg and, joining to it the royal Benedictine house of St. Maurice at Magdeburg, to make it an archbishopric. Halberstadt was in the archdiocese of Mainz; so were the new Wendish bishoprics of Havelburg and Brandenburg. The archbishop of Mainz might look forward to the inclusion of all new sees on this frontier within his archdiocese. Archbishop William was a bastard son of the king by a Slav mother, purposely chosen to succeed the very unreliable Frederick. But in this particular instance he was the archbishop of Mainz, primate of the German church, Apostolic Legate and Vicar, threatened with the loss of three bishoprics and with the end of all hopes for eastward expansion. His answer to a pope who had confirmed Otto's plans was that, so long as he lived, he would never consent to a reduction of his archdiocese or to the translation of Halberstadt..[65] He almost never did. Certainly the plans for the translation of Halberstadt were abandoned, and for them was substituted the erection of a new archdiocese at Magdeburg and of a new bishopric at Merseburg, which would cost the bishop of Halberstadt only part of his diocese. These plans, presented by the emperor before a synod in Saint Peter's and confirmed by the pope and an assembly of bishops, now ran into the resistance of Bernhard, the bishop of Halberstadt, who, while he might not object to becoming archbishop of Magdeburg, did not intend to lose Magdeburg and Merseburg, both in his diocese, and more too. Otto could only wait for this bishop to die.[66] When his own son, archbishop William, died soon after, he sent the abbot Egliluf of Hersfeld from Italy to supervise the Mainz election. Hatto, abbot of Fulda, got the see. In Halberstadt

[65] P. Jaffe, *BRG*, III, 349: Minorationem nostrae sedis translationemque Halberestetensis ecclesiae me vivo non consentiam. Sommerlad, II, 257: Dieses eigenwilligen sächsischen Hartkopfes. Hauck, III, 108-121; Wattenbach, *op. cit.*, 349.

[66] Thietmar, II, 11 (Kurze, 24): Ibi (Magdeburg) etiam episcopatum facere conatus (Otto I) apud Bernardum . . . quamdiu vixit impetrare non potuit.

Bernhard had provided for the election of a like-minded successor, the provost Hildeward, whose father, a rebel in 941, had lost his life at the hands of one of Otto's soldiers. Otto summoned both these men to Italy to come to an understanding before turning over to them their episcopal thrones.[67] The plans for the new archbishopric of Magdeburg were immediately completed. However, the situation created by this royal manipulation of dioceses on the Elbe-Saale frontier naturally offered to ambitious men an outlet and to resentful ones an opporunity to vent their grievances. Giseler, the capable and astute bishop of the new see of Merseburg, was one of the former. The bishop of Halberstadt was chief among the latter. For although Halberstadt was given its *quid pro quo,* there was still no peace with either Magdeburg [68] or Merseburg.[69] A group of dissatisfied bishops on a dangerous frontier could not be looked upon with indifference by a responsible king. Out of this confusion of circumstances, therefore, came further episcopal changes on the Elbe-Saale.

The bishopric of Merseburg had been founded partly as a result of a bargain between Otto I and Saint Lawrence on the morn of the battle of the Lechfeld. It was founded chiefly at the expense of the diocese of Halberstadt, but its very existence circumscribed its own arch-

[67] Thietmar, II, 20 (Kurze, 30): Seque ad omnia quaecumque umquam ab eo (Otto) expetisset (Hildeward) promisit paratum, si consentiret sibi hoc perficere votum. Hic autem, ut erat sapiens, piae conivebat peticioni; II, 21 (31): Tali munere (part of Halberstadt diocese) imperator arridens per manus suscepit eundem, curamque ei baculo committens pastoralem.

[68] Lites immensas exortas pene usque ad homicidia: quoted from papal synod of September 10, 981 in Dümmler, 453, n. 5. Hauck, III, 21-27; H. Gerdes, *Bischofswahlen,* 26; A. Brackmann, *Die Ostpolitik Ottos des Grossen,* HZ, vol. 134 (1926), 247: Lepsius, *Geschichte der Bischöfe des Hochstifts Naumburg,* Introduction, 1-3; Nitzsch, I, 347-348; Dümmler, 438-453.

[69] Ne . . . inter pastores ecclesiarum praedictarum Halberstadensis et Mersiburgensis homicidia plurima litigiis enutrita concrescant: quoted from 981 council in Hirsch, *JB H II,* I, 281.

bishopric of Magdeburg as well as the new bishoprics of Meissen and Zeitz. The concessions of Halberstadt on the eve of its erection did not, once Hildeward became bishop, lead to an enthusiastic support of either Merseburg or Magdeburg. Accordingly, the new diocese, not in itself a rich foundation, was harassed by Halberstadt in its purely German West-Saale territory, while with Magdeburg Halberstadt had boundary disputes. Under these circumstances there was hardly room within the small Merseburg holdings for a bishop like Giseler, who was not inclined to vent his energy in missionary activities, and, although his territory was enlarged by grants of large forest tracts, his growing influence at the court of Otto II led him to hope for and expect something more. What this something more was became clear in June 981, when the first archbishop of Magdeburg, Adalbert, died. As his successor the chapter chose the royal chaplain and well-known disputant and former head of the St. Maurice school, Ohtrich. The delegation from the chapter to secure the confirmation of Ohtrich's election, arriving at Otto II's court in Italy, found Giseler and Dietrich of Metz the most prominent of the bishops present.

The report of what follows comes mostly from a bishop-historian who in justifiable loyalty could not view without suspicion the wiping out of his own diocese.[70] Thietmar tells us that Ohtrich's delegation turned first to Giseler,[71] who, after misleading them into believing that he would intercede loyally in their behalf with the emperor, as a matter of fact took upon himself now to press for "the promised and long awaited rewards for long service," and to get the archbishopric for himself.[72] But a man, no matter how ambitious nor how capable, could scarcely expect to remain bishop of a see and to become his own archbishop as well. Giseler,

[70] Thietmar, III, 14 (Kurze, 56): Gisillerus . . . non pastor sed mercenarius ad maiora semper tendens.

[71] *Ibid.*, 13 (55): Apud imperatorem tunc plurimum valebat.

[72] *Ibid.*: Promissa et diu expectata longi laboris premia postulans . . . protinus impetrat.

therefore, had to put into play those forces necessary to secure the dissolution of Merseburg. With the expectation of an augmentation of their own dioceses, the bishops of Halberstadt, Meissen and Zeitz could hardly be looked to to resist strongly this contemplated violation of a holy pledge. We must also assume, in view of what happened, that the Magdeburg delegation was brought to see the advantages of an archbishopric so strongly intrenched in imperial favor. To Otto II squabbling and restive bishops did not appeal as good security on the Slav frontier, and besides, Giseler was a good man, too good for Merseburg and quite good enough for an enlarged see at Magdeburg. There were simpler and more direct means to build up a favorable sentiment at court among the Roman clergy who would have a voice in the final decision, and among the Germans too, chief among them the powerful relative of the crown, the bishop of Metz.[73] A compliant pope did not stand in the way, and a Lateran synod of September, 981, canonically completed the destruction of the see of Merseburg on the ground that the bishop of Halberstadt had never given his written consent to its erection, and that Halberstadt was too seriously weakened by the institution of both Magdeburg and Merseburg. To argue from the absence of a written consent to the setting up of Merseburg was as much as to say that a bishop's oral word was worth nothing, while the weakened Halberstadt was in fact still as rich as Magdeburg and Merseburg put together. But Giseler got his pallium and Magde-

[73] Thietmar, III, 13 (56): Corruptis tum pecunia [cunctis] primatibus maximeque Romanis, quibus cuncta sunt semper venalia, iudicibus qualiter ad archiepiscopatum aliqua racione veniret primum secreto revolvit deindeque palam. *Ibid.*, 16 (57): Fuit hic (Dietrich) amicus cesaris et valde ei carus, unusque ex numero corruptorum, qui mille talenta auri atque argenti pro veritatis obumbracione ab archiepiscopo percepit. Cui quidam, cum ab eodem iussu imperatoris ad matutinam ioculariter benediceretur: Saciet te, inquid, Deus in futuro, quem hic omnes non possumus auro. Granted the willingness of Thietmar to believe this report, and the remarkably large sum Dietrich is supposed to have received, I still see no reason to reject entirely this report of a time-honored method of strengthening one's case.

burg, Halberstadt, Meissen and Zeitz divided the diocese of Merseburg. Giseler asisted personally in the founding of a monastery at Merseburg, and in so doing is accused by Thietmar of manipulating Merseburg documents.[74] Thus the result of a bargain between a Kaiser and a Saint was annulled by a Kaiser and a Vicar of Christ and their trusted advisers, under the auspices of a very ambitious episcopal court favorite.

This remarkable event did not begin to prey seriously on the consciences of those responsible for some sixteen years, and then only after a series of disasters on the Slav frontier had suggested to some that Saint Lawrence was not pleased with the deprivation he had suffered, and that the manner in which it was arranged was questionable. But it was no easy matter to loosen Giseler from his archiepiscopal throne, once he had secured and strengthened it. A synod at Pavia in 997, summoned by Otto III and Gregory V, invited Giseler to come to Rome and to account for himself or lose his priestly office. He did not accept the invitation nor did he lose his office. A subsequent synod at St. Peter's decided that Merseburg was to be restored. If Giseler could show that he had gone to Magdeburg upon the invitation of clergy and people without the urgings of ambition or avarice, he was to keep Magdeburg. If he had gone uninvited but still without ambition or avarice, he was to return to Merseburg. If he were unable to clear himself from all suspicion, he was to get neither. Giseler sent a personal representative to Rome, who managed to have the matter postponed until it could be considered by the German bishops and the Kaiser. The setting up of an independent Polish church, free from what had hitherto been German control, made it likely that Giseler would be able to resist these efforts with the support of his fellow German bishops. Upon Otto's return from Gnesen Giseler managed to have the question postponed to a Qued-

[74] Thietmar, III, 16 (58): Precepta, quae munera regalia seu imperialia detinebant, aut igni comburebat, aut aecclesiae suae mutato nomine designari fecit. Mancipia et totum quod Merseburg respicere debuit ne umquam colligeretur, sponte dispergit.

linburg synod, after, in questionable fashion, having evaded an imperial request to return to Merseburg.[75] He was not present at Quedlinburg, so the matter was postponed again to an Aachen synod. At Aachen he did appear, demanding that the question be considered only by a general council.[76] With the apparent support of his fellow bishops he was thwarting emperor and pope and gaining valuable time. However, unlike Otto III, Henry II did not waste time with synods. Giseler, still archbishop of Magdeburg, was a dying man. On the chance that under such conditions he might be given over to repentance, a strong delegation, headed by the formidable archbishop of Mainz, Willigis, was sent to his deathbed to inquire what he intended to do about Merseburg. Giseler's answer was to ask for another postponement.[77] In the interval he died. Within a week the royal chaplain, Tagino, had been consecrated as his successor at Magdeburg, and within another week Merseburg was restored. Arnulf of Halberstadt was adequately compensated for further small sacrifices to Merseburg.[78] Meissen and Zeitz were obliged to be content with their former boundaries, for which at least Zeitz was later compensated at royal expense. Tagino gave what was expected of him to the royal chaplain Wigbert, the new bishop of Merseburg. From the experience of four Saxon emperors with this succession of recalcitrant bishops it is apparent that to get around these stubborn resisters nothing

---

[75] Thietmar, IV, 46 (90): Archiepiscopus . . . imperatoris edictu priorem suscipere sedem rogatus, data internuntiis magna pecunia, inducias usque ad Quidilingeburg vix impetravit.

[76] *Ibid.*: Qui (Giseler) sapienti consilio usus, generale sibi postulat dari concilium; sicque indiscussa dilata sunt haec omnia.

[77] *Ibid.*, V, 39 (129): Quibus vix talibus respondit: Dentur mihi trium vel quatuor induciae dierum et mihi liceat abire; quibus transactis certa vobis referam.

[78] *Ibid.*, 44 (132): Rex . . . quia aliter non posse . . . apud Arnulfum presulem sciebat [cum] centum concambio mansorum super solum Merseburgiensem burgwardum episcopalem redemit bannum.

availed but to wait until they died and then to make a deal with their successors.[79]

When the time came for the childless Henry II to beget a memorial of himself, it was, significantly enough, not a monastery that the friend of bishops chose to found, but a new bishopric, Bamberg. To do so required not only that he should at a stroke give to Bamberg what it had taken centuries for other bishops to acquire for themselves, but that he should come to terms with the two neighboring bishops out of whose dioceses the new see must be carved. On the face of it this seemed an easy matter. Henry of Würzburg, unlike his brother Heribert of Cologne, had been devoted to the king and Megingaud of Eichstätt had Saxon royal blood in his veins. As a matter of fact it turned out to be a very difficult matter to accomplish. Bishop Henry, who control'ed one of the most prosperous sees in Germany, was willing at first to accept compensation for what he was to give to the new see, but only on condition that the king be willing also to assist in raising Würzburg to archiepiscopal rank, with Bamberg as a suffragan bishopric.[80] When it became apparent that this was impossible for the king to accomplish, possibly because of the opposition of Willigis, archbishop of Mainz, Henry of Würzburg considered himself grossly deceived, and henceforth would have nothing to do with the creation of Bamberg. No entreaties, no letters, no promises could move him. He seemed to be continually on the go with the deliberate intention of avoiding the reception of proposals from the king or from bishops cooperating with the king, whom he looked on only as accomplices in deceit. It was necessary for Henry II to go ahead without him, and when the impressive synod

[79] J. V. Pflugk-Harttung, *Das Bisthum Merseburg unter den Sächsischen Kaisern, Forschungen zur Deutschen Geschichte*, XXV, 152-177 (1885); E. E. Schmidt, *op. cit.;* Hauck, III, 142-146; 410-413; 267-268; Uhlirz, *JB O II*, 159-161; Hirsch, *JB H II*, 274-288; Thompson, *Feudal Germany*, 402-403.

[80] Thietmar, VI, 30 (Kurze, 151): Dilecti senioris iustas peticiones presul benigne suscipiens ea racione consensit ut pallium suae permittens ecclesiae Bavenbergiensem sibi subderet pastorem.

of Frankfort met under the chairmanship of Willigis in November 1007, he was not present. But his chaplain was, and with the privileges of Würzburg on his person. Henry II was a most humble king before these assembled archbishops and bishops. His opening speech was preceded by prostration before them, but the humility of his act was not carried into his speech when he came to speak of the bishop of Würzburg: the bishop was ambitious, and this it was that led him to presume to block royal plans looking toward the glory of God.[81] The representative of Würzburg replied that it was rather fear of the king than anything else that kept his bishop away; that never had the bishop agreed that the church given to him by God should suffer any loss. Then he began to read the privileges of Würzburg in a loud voice.[82] There was probably no bishop present that did not sympathize with the bishop of Würzburg's position, even though it might be unheard of for a bishop in such a case to proceed to such extreme limits of resistance. Henry II resorted to further prostrations as he watched the episcopal heads nod to the reading of the privileges.[83] The end of it all was that the synod approved of the establishment of Bamberg without Würzburg's consent. Seven months later Henry of Würzburg himself ceased to dissent, and in return received more than had been originally intended as indemnification for the cessions to Bamberg. Not so with the stubborn Megingaud of Eichstätt. So long as he lived there was no exchange with

---

[81] Thietmar, VI, 31 (152): Ne absencia eius, qui apud me voluit obtinere, quod mihi non licuit huic concedere, propositum voluntatis meae queat impedire, cum . . . clarescat, hunc non propter Deum, sed ob dignitatis nullatenus adipiscendae dolorem fugisse . . . quod per ambitionem suam sanctae matris aecclesiae augmentum annullare . . . presumit.

[82] *Ibid.*, 32: Propter timorem regis seniorem suum huc non venisse et detrimentum aecclesiae sibi a Deo commissae in aliquo fieri numquam laudasse testatus. . . . Privilegia eiusdem ibi alta voce recitantur.

[83] *Ibid.*: Inter haec quocies rex anxiam iudicum sententiam nutare prospexit, toties prostratus humiliatur.

the king in Bamberg's behalf.[84] When he was happily gone, his servile successor, under local pressure, still went as far as he dared in resisting an accommodation with the king,[85] which was not consummated until 1015.[86]

The prolonged struggle between the archbishop of Mainz and the bishop of Hildesheim as to whether the nunnery of Gandersheim were in the diocese of Mainz or Hildesheim is not only in itself richly illustrative of the bishop doggedly insisting upon what he regards as his rights, but at the same time an episode in the struggle between regular and secular clergy. The issues in this struggle were the full exercise by the bishop of his diocesan rights of visitation and the episcopal policy of acquiring as many independently owned monasteries as possible. The gathering force of the Cluniac movement in Lorraine brought with it an unsparing criticism of the secular preoccupations of the episcopate and a threat to the generally predominant rôle that the bishop played in the state as well as in the church. Many bishops in fact sympathized with the movement, for there was no doubt that a reformed monastery was likely to be a better economic asset to a bishop than an unreformed one. Nevertheless, it was in any event important to keep the movement under episcopal control. By the beginning of the eleventh century it had spread across the Rhine, where it was supported by Henry II. Hungarian devastations and secularizations had brought monastic life in Germany, especially in the south, to a low ebb, and had facilitated and made desirable the sub-

[84] *Anon. Haser.*, c. 25, *MGH, SS* VII, 260: Solus agonista noster tam moribus quam genere fretus viriliter sibi restitit, et ad vitae usque finem iniquo concambio nullatenus acquiescere voluit.

[85] *Ibid.*: Illo vero feliciter defuncto . . . Sub hoc episcopo (Gundekar) cum caesar propositi sui properus predictum concambium maturare vellet, et novus ille episcopus capellanorum ac militum suorum tunc praecipuorum consilio fretus constanter restitisset . . . ut abhominabile concambium potenter potius quam voluntarie sit factum.

[86] Hauck, III, 418-428; Hirsch, *JB H II*, 42-180; Riezler, I, 426-427; Nitzsch, I, 391-392. For further details, see pp. 74-75; for Megingaud's attitude toward Henry II, cf. chap. IX, p. 245.

ordination of these institutions to the capable economic administrator that the tenth century bishop often enough was. The monastic endowment of Würzburg, Augsburg or Bamberg and the wholesale transference of Bavarian monasteries into episcopal hands shows the extent to which this subordination was taking place.[87] It was a tendency strongly resisted by the monasteries themselves, as anxious to preserve their own independent position as the bishops were to destroy it.[88] Episcopal control also meant a firmer control, as well as the use of monastic property for episcopal ends.[89] The rivalry inevitably ensuing between abbot and bishop for recognition by the king and the many violent local disputes over tithing

---

[87] Hirsch, *JB H II*, II, 51 ff., 116-120, 97-101.

[88] *Cont. Reg.*, 950 (Kurze, 164): Ruotbertus archiepiscopus pro adquirenda abbatia Sancti Maximini multum laboravit, sed Deo propicio non prevaluit.

[89] E.g. the complaints of the Saint Emmeram monks against Gebehard, bishop of Regensburg: Thietmar, VI, 41 (Kurze, 158): Ibi tunc confratres . . . unanimiter regis pedibus provoluti ex parte presulis suimet Gebehardi multa flebiliter me eadem audiente queruntur et laici presentes magni lamentationibus hiis subsequuntur. Saint Emmeram was freed from episcopal control by Wolfgang of Regensburg (972-994), though in the division of the property the bishop retained the best part: Janner, I, 350-379. Frederick of Salzburg gave to the Saint Peter's monastery in Salzburg its own abbot: Hirsch, I, 129. For Megingaud of Eichstätt see *Anon. Haser*, c. 19, *MGH, SS* VII, 258: Cum autem familiam Sancti Willibaldi inprimis durius tractasset, tandemque clamor eorum ad aures clementissimi patroni pervenisset. Widukind speaks of the *grave onus sacerdotum* upon the monasteries, II, 37 (Kehr, 83). Udalrich of Augsburg is praised because he keeps the monasteries in his own hands: *Vita Oudalrici*, c. 5, *MGH, SS* IV, 393: Ad monasteria pertinentia ad episcopatum . . . quae numquam in beneficium laicorum concessit . . . sed ad suam potestatem optima quaeque detinuit, ea videlicet causa, ut facultatem ea visitandi et ibi manendi et quae necessaria erant corrigendi in stipendiis habuisset. After Udalrich got Ottobeuren from the crown he made quite clear to the monks his ideas concerning free election: *Ibid.*, c. 25, 410: Si illum eligitis qui mihi ad hoc placet, commendabo illi abpatiam usque in praesentiam domini mei imperatoris; sin autem alium nisi mihi placentem eligitis, non illi commendabo.

rights, helped to make the situation ever more tense.[90] To whatever extent the kings supported the bishops against the monasteries, they were, of course, forging an added bond between crown and episcopate. But the generosity of the crown to the regular clergy continued throughout the tenth century, and we can discern no fixed preference for the bishop in this struggle until the reign of Henry II.[91]

The protagonists in the early years of the Gandersheim dispute were Willigis, an outstanding political figure since Otto I, and Bernward, the imperial favorite especially of Otto III. They were succeeded by the pugnacious Aribo and his formidable rival, Godehard, a genuinely devout monk who made an excellent bishop. Even in the face of the favor displayed towards the bishops of Hildesheim by both Otto III and Henry II, the archbishops of Mainz, thrown largely as they were on their own strategy, were still able to force their opponents to employ every available resource to hold their ground.

Gandersheim, a foundation of 852 in the diocese of Hildesheim, by its removal in 856 may well have been brought within the technical limits of the diocese of Mainz, though certainly it was commonly regarded as pertaining to Hildesheim. In addition to its wealth, which was considerable, it possessed the additional importance of being generally presided over by some female member of the royal house, which established valuable contacts for the bishop exercising supervisory control. The incident that opened the dispute centered about a daughter of Otto II, Sophia, who seems to have chosen to be consecrated as a nun of Gandersheim rather by an archbishop of Mainz, Willigis, than by a simple bishop of Hildesheim, Osdag. As a matter of fact, both Willigis and Osdag presented themselves at the ceremony, and,

[90] E.g., the chief thing on the minds of the bishops of Osnabrück seems to have been their protracted dispute with Corvey and Hersfeld over tithes: Möser, *Osnabrückische Geschichte*, II, 98 ff.

[91] Hauck, III, 458-460; Sommerlad, II, 260-264; Nitzsch, I, 348, 390-391; Gerdes, I, 503-504; Thompson, *Feudal Germany*, 62-64; Dümmler, 527.

although Willigis took the opportunity to press his claims to the institution, the participation of both bishops in the ceremony avoided more than a lively exchange of opinions. When this same Sophia subsequently left her monastic home to while away a year or so at court, she brought upon herself the severe condemnation of the new bishop of Hildesheim, Bernward, though Willigis was indulgent enough. When later Sophia became abbess of the nunnery, she fostered so strong an anti-Bernward-Hildesheim sentiment as to make it literally impossible for Bernward to pretend to perform visitations. In 1000 the conflict came to a head for a second time when a new abbey church was to be consecrated. On this occasion Bernward, who had arrived earlier than the proposed date, by undertaking to conduct services in the church roused the sisters to a veritable fury. When Willigis arrived it was decided to let the consecration wait upon the decision of what turned out to be only the first of a series of synods continued for thirty years. Meanwhile Bernward betook himself for support to Kaiser and Pope at Rome, sending as his representative to this first synod at Gandersheim bishop Ekkehard of Schleswig.

Ekkehard's contention that nothing could be done in Bernward's absence so aroused Willigis's anger that he was threatened with ejection and did leave after a tumultous session.[92] Willigis's synod then declared that Gandersheim belonged to Mainz. This decision only strengthened Bernward's case at Rome with his devoted pupil, Otto III. A Roman synod of January, 1001, ruled that Gandersheim belonged to Hildesheim, summoned a synod of Saxon bishops to meet at Pöhlde in June, and arranged for a Saxon papal legate to be present to execute the papal decree. This synod

[92] *Vita Bernwardi*, c. 20, *MGH, SS* IV, 768: Ad haec incredibili furore archiepiscopus succensus vultu torvo ac minaci iubet ut sileat: nil ad se talium pertinere; ut propriam aecclesiam habeat, illam gubernet . . . Qua unanimitate cleri et plebis archiepiscopus commotus. Eggehardo episcopo minatur, nisi sileat, quod cum iniuria illum eiciat . . . cum propemodum tumultus oriretur, Eggehardus secessit. Thangmar, the author of this life, is a very loyal Hildesheim partisan.

ended in a furor with which the previous one at Gandersheim was not to be compared. The bishops, out of sympathy with a king whose un-German tendencies were only too patent, showed no respect for the representative of his papal ally and turned over the sitting to Willigis.[93] When he was not able to prevent the papal discourse from being read, the doors of the church were thrown open and a crowd of Mainz sympathizers and retainers, in a clash of arms and in execration of the apostolic delegate Frederick and bishop Bernward, broke up the session.[94] Willigis was suspended from his office and summoned to Rome along with the rest of the German bishops. But he did not go, neither did he forfeit his office. On the contrary, he actually prevented Bernward by violent means from spending a feast day with the sisters of Hilwardshausen, a nunnery in the diocese of Mainz.[95] By the ladies of Gandersheim he was so loyally supported that at the threat of a visitation on the part of Bernward Sophia organized a small army containing some troops from Mainz and turned the monastery into a fortress to keep him away.[96] As if there had been no imperial or papal decisions made, another synod was

[93] *Vita Bernwardi*, c. 28, *MGH, SS* IV, 771: Sed postquam ad concilium ventum est, vix dici poterit, quanta seditione et tumultu agitaretur. Nam nec locus sessionis vicario apostolici idoneus conceditur, horribilis strepitus ingeminatur, ius fasque contempnitur, canonica disciplina annullatur.

[94] *Ibid.*, 772: Ianuae interim aecclesiae panduntur, laici intromittuntur, fit strepitus tumultusque validus, Mogontinis exultantibus arma exposcunt, immensas minas ingerunt adversus apostolici vicarium et Bernwardum episcopum.

[95] *Ibid.*, c. 31, 772: Cum iam omnia parata essent, et ipse (Bernward) in proximo futurus esset, supervenientes nocturno tempore homines archiepiscopi, cuncta invadentes dissipaverunt, aliquantos vero domesticos episcopi crudeliter caesos dimiserunt.

[96] *Ibid.*, c. 32, 772: Cui (Bernward) obstitit immensa multitudo, non minus armis instructa, quam si ad publicum bellum cogerentur. Hos concivit Sophya, cunctos videlicet quos vel de vassatico archiepiscopi vel de familia illius convocare poterat, omnes suos notos et familiares, et de propria familia manum validam: turres et munitiora loca circa aecclesiam armato complent milite, et contra unum hominem, suum videlicet episcopum, . . . ita castellum muniunt, quasi barbarico procinctu se defendere parent.

summoned at Frankfort, which settled nothing in the absence of Bernward, who had meanwhile sent another representative to Rome. The death of both Otto III and Sylvester II finally left the problem for Henry II to settle. At Pöhlde he obliged both Bernward and Willigis to submit to his solution, and in a few days, at the final dedication of the Gandersheim church in 1007, despite the prominence of Willigis and his fidelity to him, Henry decided in Hildesheim's favor and Willigis was obliged publicly to renounce his claims.[97]

How Willigis, archbishop of Mainz for over thirty years, took this royal decision we can only imagine, but at any rate the incident remained closed until the contentious[98] Bavarian Aribo was raised to the see of Mainz. He had been warned by Bernward before the completion of his consecration that Gandersheim was a matter not to be brought up again. He himself undertook to use these same tactics when Bernward's successor, Godehard, was about to be consecrated: he was to remember that he was not to perform any episcopal functions at Gandersheim. This reminder Godehard could afford to answer politely if firmly,[99] in the presence of Henry II, who was thoroughly angered to see this old ghost walk again. Aribo was informed that the matter was to be dropped,[100] and dropped it was until the accession of Conrad II, with which Aribo had a great deal to do. What followed was a bewildering succession of synods and court sessions,[101] for the most part in Hildesheim's favor, which exhausted the patience of the attending bishops, especially of the suffragan bishops of

---

[97] Böhmer, *Willigis*, 87-105; Bertram, *Geschichte des Bistums Hildesheim*, I, 66, ff.: Hauck, III, 268-270; 414-418; Nitzsch, I, 384.

[98] *Vita Godehardi prior*, c. 25, *MGH, SS* XI, 185: in humanis supra modum animosus, ut de quodam in veteribus dicitur, manus eius contra omnes, et manus omnium contra eum.

[99] *Ibid.*, 186: Si iuste vobis cedit, nulli melius annuo quam vobis; si autem mihi meoque iuri, nulli libentius praeopto subici quam mihi.

[100] *Ibid.*: Metropolitanum . . . animosa admodum animi invectione iussit in posterum ab huiusmodi desistere ceptis.

[101] Goslar, Grona, Gandersheim, Seligenstadt, Frankfort, Geisleben, Pöhlde, Merseburg.

Mainz themselves.[102] Nothing could exhaust either of the two contestants. Things came finally to such a pass that when at Frankfort, in September 1027, Aribo begged for another postponement, he excited the synod to mirth.[103] Moreover, one of the chief factors in the situation had meanwhile changed, in that when archiepiscopal enthusiasm in Gandersheim actually carried five young ladies away to Mainz, where for the sake of being near Aribo they entered his sister's monastery, Sophia had turned to Godehard for support in this crisis. Although Aribo was obliged at Frankfort to send these sisters home, they were soon back in Mainz again. Godehard himself was obliged to tolerate having his letters to them torn up and his chaplain told to leave or suffer serious consequences.[104] The struggle was also enlivened by personal disputes between Aribo and Godehard, as to which of the two was to say mass before the high altar at Gandersheim,[105] not to mention synods and counter-synods in which each anathematized any one recognizing the other's rights over the monastery. At Seligenstadt Aribo offered to prove the righteousness of his case by summoning one hundred priests and three hundred laymen, but the episcopal judges refused to consider this substitute for themselves. At Frankfort he was unable to thwart another decision in Godehard's favor, but four years later he brought up the matter again at Pöhlde because he would not have it thought that he could not or would not defend the interests of his diocese.[106] Godehard, however, had already declared that while he lived nothing except a

[102] A victory over Hildesheim might well make the Mainz suffragans anxious. Aribo was in addition taking steps to consolidate the archdiocese by the regular convocation of provincial synods.

[103] *Vita Godehardi prior*, c. 32, *MGH*, *SS* XI, 191: Risum ingentem tam inter primates quam et ceteros excitavit.

[104] *Ibid.*, c. 29, 189: Cartas insipiciente legato disciderunt, ipsumque prout vitae membrorumque incolomitatem servare cupiverit festinanter regredi iusserunt.

[105] *Ibid.*, c. 26, 187.

[106] *Ibid.*, c. 35, 193: Iam diutius super hoc reticere non praesumere, ne videretur suae ecclesiae ius aut nescire aut nequire aut certe nolle defendere.

general council could force him to give up what he possessed.[107] By 1030 Aribo gave up the attempt to continue the struggle against Godehard, in the face of the indifference or hostility of his own suffragans and the rest of the German bishops. At the beginning of the following year he quitted the German scene for Rome, never to return.[108]

Meanwhile Gandersheim was not the only concern with which Aribo was troubled. He had also to deal with that warm-blooded pair, Count Otto of Hammerstein and Irmingarde, whom neither episcopal nor royal decrees could induce to dissolve a marriage declared uncanonical because of their too close relationship. Erkanbald, Aribo's predecessor, had suffered devastation of his diocese and had almost been captured by the incensed husband, who resented the legal-mindedness of the clergy. Since Henry II had also chosen to support the law in this case, he felt obliged to avenge this attack on the most important ecclesiastical prince in Germany by laying siege to Hammerstein in the winter of 1020-1021 and expelling the devoted couple. Their subsequent reunion was the occasion of a synod at Mainz in June, 1023, which reiterated the curse of the church upon the two and led Irmingarde to take an appeal to Rome. This move, in its way a challenge to episcopal authority, was met at the synod at Seligenstadt in August by an attempt to make this sort of appeal more difficult in the future. Along with a series of regulations calculated to unify ecclesiastical practices for the archidiocese of Mainz, to prevent disrespect for churches and

---

[107] *Vita Godehardi prior*, c. 27, *MGH, SS* XI, 188: Quandiu enim hac mortali vita vixero, nullius vel metu deterente vel blandimento seducente nisi in generali concilio et universali fratrum consilio vestituram quam in hoc accepi numquam omisero.

[108] W. Dersch, *Die Kirchenpolitik des Erzbischofs Aribo von Mainz* (1021-1031), 42-51; R. Müller, *Erzbischof Aribo von Mainz*, 14-61; H. A. Lünztel, *Geschichte der Diöcese und Stadt Hildesheim*, I, 146-221; Bresslau, *JB H II*, III, 229-233, 253-254. The dispute between Pilgrim of Cologne and Durand of Liège over the monastery of Burtscheid in Aachen is another example of the same type of dispute as the epic struggle for Gandersheim: Hirsch, *JB H II*, III, 54-55.

to abolish supersitious practices, there appear two simple statements to the effect that no one may go to Rome without the consent of his bishop or the bishop's vicar, and that in no case shall such an appeal be permitted until the sinner has fully performed the penance imposed by the local priest, and received a letter from the bishop to introduce him at Rome. This was clear enough: episcopal authority within the diocese was strengthened and a check was put upon errant countesses who might be disposed to flout it in the future. It was also, possibly, a warning to a lenient pope that local discipline must be preserved. Nevertheless, Irmingarde's activities in Rome were successful. It was decided that her case be investigated by a papal commission to Germany, and that in the meantime Aribo be deprived of the pallium. This was a serious step, which the suffragans of Mainz could not tolerate, for it involved not only Aribo but all those clergy and laymen who had been active in the decisions against Count Otto and his wife. The protest against this papal interference took the form of a respectful letter from the suffragans, calling the pope's attention to the fact that his action was a thrust not only at Aribo but at all of them, since they had concurred in his determined action. If it were to be believed that Benedict VIII had gone so far as to deprive Aribo of papal favor, as rumor had it, then it were well that the pope reconsider his action and return his favor to a righteous bishop who was only taking proper action against a wayward woman. Aribo himself was preparing to call another synod for Höchst to meet on May 13, 1024, to consider the procedure to be followed concerning the papal legation, and even went so far as to enlist the services of Queen Kunigunde to secure an impressive attendance. The death of both Benedict VIII and Henry II precluded what promised to be an interesting development. Here indeed was another question of episcopal prerogatives that had yet to be determined. But from the moment when the question first arose it was met with the same spirit as met all threats to what the bishops considered their legitimate rights. Aribo

did not forget the Hammerstein case either. At the synod of Frankfort in 1027 he brought it up again, and for a second time a king had to request him to change the subject.[109]

C.

THE BISHOPS AND THE NOBILITY

If the wealth of the church was great enough to attract into the priesthood ambitious men anxious to participate in its administration and increase, and great enough to seem to the kings a resource so indispensable that for the privilege of its use they were ready to pay the necessary price of constantly adding to the church's capital wealth, it could hardly fail to tempt the local dukes to usurp and the lesser nobility to plunder. Naturally the bishops and the nobles were ready rivals in the accumulation of property and honor, and when their interests crossed a latent hostility broke out, by no means always restricted to mutual recriminations. The church had always to complain of marauding attacks upon its property and the persons of its clergy. In so far as it could not defend itself alone, it looked to the crown for support, and when, as in the tenth and early eleventh centuries, it received that support in abundance for an equally abundant *quid pro quo*, the normal and inevitable friction between noble and bishop was only thereby increased. It is of course possible to exaggerate this rivalry. The hostilities that have come to light are more dramatically interesting than the unreported cooperation that escapes attention because the difficulties of its achievement are not so easy to perceive. It is idle withal to suppose that there was either more or less class animosity in the tenth century than there has ever been. Nor must we forget that we are listening to one side of the story, which, although it is neither implausible nor unconvinc-

---

[109] Dersch, 5-37; Müller, *Aribo*, 23-36; Hauck, III, 530-538; Bresslau, *JB H II*, III, 172, 283-289 *et passim;* Nitzsch, I, 395-396. The comments of Emerton, *Medieval Europe*, 163-166, would in large part have to be modified.

ing, and may well be wholly true, is yet pervaded by an injured self-righteousness that is all too likely not to tell the whole truth. For all the vast debt we owe the churchmen for whatever knowledge we have, be it much or little, what would we not give for the testimony of one lone spokesman for the tenth century nobility? *Les absents ont toujours tort.* And yet, even if the tenth century nobleman had been able to read and write, what chance, one wonders, would his impious manuscript have had to survive, in church or monastery, or, for that matter, at court, in chancellery or school, manned exclusively by the same clergy?

No one, within the church or without, could rejoice in the peace and prosperity of the times.[110] The bishops were obliged to submit to pressure willingly or unwillingly from various groups of the nobility. Their relations with the new dukes were in reduced measure expected to correspond to their relations with the king. There was no repetition of the extensive secularizations of Arnulf and Burchard, but there is plenty of evidence that relations between duke and bishop were often enough far from peaceful. The dukes brought pressure to bear on the church, especially the bishops, for assistance in maintaining or enhancing their positions. We have already seen the bishops of Constance and Chur constrained to support Herman of Swabia in his campaign for the imperial election after the death of Otto III. When Werinher (Wicelin) of Strassburg refused to submit to similar pressure, he paid with just such a thoroughgoing devastation of his city as Udalrich of Augsburg had had to

[110] *Cont. Reg.*, 920 (Kurze, 156): Multi enim illis temporibus etiam nobiles latrociniis insudabant. *Vita Burchardi*, Prologus, *MGH, SS* IV, 831: Quam perniciosi sunt homines moderni, quam pleni diversarum cogitationum. Thietmar, IX, 13 (Kurze, 247): Tempora haec prioribus cunctis inferiora plus demunt, quam alicui addunt. Widukind, II, 10 (Kehr, 42): Fiebant preterea multa nefaria a seditiosis, homicidia, periuria, depopulationes, incendia; aequum pravumque, sanctum periuriumque illis diebus parum procedebant. Burchard of Worms speaks of his day as *tumultuantis saeculi*: Migne, *P. L.*, vol. 140, col. 453; Koeniger, 11, n. 1.

suffer at the hands of the rebellious duke of Bavaria for his devotion to Otto I.[111] When during this struggle the partisans of duke Herman caught Werinher and the bishop of Basel, another Swabian supporter of Henry II, in well fortified Breisach, the town was plundered and a clever ruse almost cost the bishops' capture.[112] And how far a duke's revenge might go when he succeeded in laying hands upon a bishop whom he regarded as his enemy we have already seen in the dreadful fate of Harold of Salzburg.[113] The rebellious activities of Henry of Augsburg in 974-978, which got him into the bad graces of duke Otto, were influenced by what he regarded as demands for *servitia* in excess of what had been demanded by the duke of his predecessors.[114] Christian of Passau in 993 received from Otto III exemptions from ducal *servitia,* very suggestive of what the pressure upon the Bavarian episcopate could be, still, however, carefully reserving *servitia* due to the crown.[115] In Saxony Adam of Bremen traces a conflict between duke and bishop centering around

---

[111] Thietmar, V, 12 (Kurze, 114). Dux autem . . . caput ducatus sui Argentinam, que Strazburg dicitur, quia episcopus eiusdem urbis Wicelinus sibi resistere presumpserit . . . milite petit armato murosque ascendens nil victis reliquid. Sed execrata Alemannorum turba ad rapiendum promptissima inscio duce maiorem ecclesiam . . . intrans omnem thesaurum diripit et . . . igne domum Domini consumpsit. Cf. *MGH, DD* III, 38, No. 34. Hirsch, *JB H II,* I, 217-218.

[112] Thietmar, *Chron.,* V, 21 (Kurze, 119).

[113] See note 31.

[114] *Vita Oudalrici,* c. 28, *MGH, SS* IV, 416, 417, 418: Pro hac vero re Otto dux contra eum iratus coepit cum suis fidelibus consiliari, ut ei in quibuscumque potuisset adversaretur; quod et fecit . . . quia a duce multipliciter plus quam antecessores sui iniuriabatur. . . . Adhuc autem intus magna angustia mentis angebatur pro eo quod a duce Ottone, quamvis exterius pacificati essent, plus cogebatur quam antecessores sui ei servitium facere de rebus sanctae Mariae.

[115] *MGH, DD* II, 527, No. 115: Ecclesiae . . . quae semper non parvam molestiam perpessa est a ducibus quasi debitam inde exigentibus servitutem . . . ut nullus dehinc dux vel alia quaelibet potens persona de eadem ecclesia vel locis illuc pertinentibus servitutem aliquo modo exigat debitam aut coactam tollere praesumat sed ipsa . . . ab omni ducum aliarumque potentium personarum invito servicio perpetualiter

the loyalist question, which grew in intensity from the very institution of the Billunger dukes until it broke forth in the abortive revolt of duke Bernhard in 1011.[116] Archbishop Unwan, knowing very well what his church was likely to suffer, fortified Bremen against possible attacks of the duke, and was active in bringing him to terms with Henry II.[117] At least one bishop in Saxony, Bruno of Verden, refused to remove a sentence of excommunication from the dead duke Herman, even though his son implored it and though the duke was an uncle of the bishop.[118]

The success of Burchard, the bishop of Worms, in challenging the position of duke Otto of Franconia in the city is an uncommonly good illustration of the same clash of rival noble and episcopal interests within the bishop's town that we shall meet in some of the episcopal centers in Lorraine.[119] A fort belonging to Otto and his son in Worms harbored every interest inimical to the bishop, a situation that occasioned frequent altercations.[120] Burchard took upon himself to

immunis consistat, excepto quod regio honori vel imperatoriae dignitati praesens provisor . . . ecclesiae suique successores caritativa mente iusteque impendere debent. Cf. Hirsch, *JB H II*, I, 57-58.

[116] *Adam Bremensis*, II, 48 (Schmeidler, 108-109): Ex illo enim tempore, quo dux constitutus est in hac regione numquam discordia cessavit inter geminas domos, scilicet archiepiscopi et ducis, illis impugnantibus regem et ecclesiam, istis pro salute ecclesiae ac fidelitate regum certantibus. Haec aemulatio partium, dum prius occulta esset, ex eo tempore vires accepit et crevit in immensum . . . Novissimo (Bernardus) surgens in Christum ecclesias huius patriae non dubitavit impugnare, precipue vero nostram quae et dicior eo tempore ceteris et longinquior videbatur a manu imperatoris.

[117] *Ibid.*: Ipso tempore ferunt aggerem Bremensis oppidi firmatum contra insidias et impetus inimicorum regis, precipue quoniam dux Bernardus Henrico imperatori ausus rebellare terruit ac turbavit omnes ecclesias Saxoniae.

[118] Thietmar, II, 31 (Kurze, 38): Sed is quod postulat nequaquam inpetrat.

[119] *Vide infra*, chap. III.

[120] *Vita Burchardi*, c. 7, *MGH, SS* IV, 835: Munitionem turribus et variis aedificiis firmissimam, ad quam domum raptores et fures et omnes contra episcopum delinquentes refugium tutissimum habebant . . . ob hoc obtruncationes et homicidia multa ex utraque parte fiebant.

remove this menace. His first measures were to strengthen the fortifications of his city, an exemplification frequently met in the tenth and eleventh centuries of the rivalry between bishop and duke. [121] But this was only a half measure: the fort must go. When once he had obtained Henry II's promise to assist him in this work of destruction,[122] in this "liberation of his city", Burchard did not let him forget.[123] Henry arranged an exchange with Otto,[124] the king being thus the instrument of liberation for a persistent bishop.[125] The victory was celebrated by the annihilation of Otto's fort on the very day that he left it, and in his presence. The new monastery built from the material of the old fort bore the inscription *ecclesiam ob libertatem civitatis.*[126] These events, this transformation of a *domus contentionis* into a *domus reconciliationis*, when they reached the ear of Thietmar of Merseburg, who had his own troubles with the nobility, inspired the Saxon bishop to poetry.[127]

---

[121] *Vita Burchardi*, c. 7, *MGH, SS* IV, 835: Curtim suam muro, civitatem ad instar castelli circundedit, et interius, turribus et habitaculis ad pugnandum idoneis non segniter excitatis, munitionem satis firmam construxit.

[122] *Vide supra*, note 58.

[123] *Vita Burchardi*, c. 9, *MGH, SS* IV, 836: Burchardus . . . suae non immemor promissionis, die noctuque ob libertatem suae civitatis regem incessanter admonuit.

[124] *MGH, DD* III, 23, No. 20. Burchard, of his part in the transaction: Wormacensis civitas quam ego praediis meis et pecunia a duce Ottone ex magna parte redemi (quoted in Koeniger, *Burchard von Worms*, 65).

[125] *Vita Burchardi, loc. cit.*: Ita quoque Wormacia iniquo servitio diu subacta piis episcopi laboribus liberata est.

[126] *Ibid.*: Ergo eadem die qua dux de hac munitione discessit, episcopus multis congregatis eandem domum duce inspiciente invasit, et usque ad fundamentum avida manu omnino destruxit.

[127] Thietmar, *Chron.* (Kurze, 133):

> Urbs Wormacensis gaudet temporibus istis
> Libertate sua, cuius manebat in umbra
> Hactenus, atque ducum fuerat sub lege suorum.
> Burchard antistes laetatur . . .

Thietmar observes that the clergy suffer at the hands not only of dukes but of mere counts.[128] From him we hear more condemnation of the secular nobility than from any other source in the tenth and early eleventh centuries, and he seems indeed loath to omit any of the many incidents of conflict that he has experienced or knows of. For the difficulty he blames the infectious class pride of the nobility, which will tolerate no semblance of equality in other classes:[129] the bishop must comply with the noble's will or suffer scorn and depradation.[130] The only hope he sees in imperial support,[131] although, as we have already remarked, it was just this support that tended to make matters worse, as some of the churchmen themselves recognized,[132] especially when tendered in behalf of ambitious bishops who were themselves envious of the nobility.[133] At the same time Thietmar is not quite

[128] Thietmar, I, 26 (Kurze, 16): Audivi tamen nonnullos (pastores) sub ducum, et quod plus doleo, sub comitum potestatem magnam sustinere calumniam, quibus nil licitum est, nisi quod seculi amatoribus prodest.

[129] *Ibid.*, IX, 23 (Kurze, 252): Superbia seniorum instigat furorem satellitum et quia hiis sufficit, equales sibi alios in hiis partibus esse non permittit.

[130] *Ibid.*: Episcopatus in hiis partibus constituti ab eorum potentia sunt nimium depressi; . . . si contra Deum et iusticiam eius voluntati eorum in cunctis satisfacimus, honorem et aliquam utilitatem habemus, sin autem, contempnimur et, [sic] ut nobis nullus aut regnet aut imperet dominus, depredamur. *Ibid.*, 24 (Kurze, 253): De coepiscopis in diversa huius mundi parte constitutis ineffabileque detrimentum perpessis . . . quia absque omni honore . . . eos esse graviter ingemisco.

[131] *Ibid.*, 14 (Kurze, 248): Ve temporibus illis in quibus deest haec spes miseris et aecclesiae Merseburgiensi!

[132] *Vita Bernwardi*, c. 7, *MGH, SS* IV, 761: Pro his et caeteris beneficiis quae devotissimo studio in rem publicam populumque fidelem exercuit, multorum et maxime principum in se invidiam et indignationem commovit.

[133] Thietmar, IV, 73 (Kurze, 105): Augusto sepe memorato (Otto II) Gisillerus archipresul multum carus fuit, quod Ekkihardum marchionem primo latenter momordit, posteaque paululum emersit, cum hunc in omnibus sibi priorem esse non sine gravi dolore persensit. *Vita Bernwardi*, c. 18, *MGH, SS* IV, 766-767: Affectuosissimo . . . obsequio

sure that he and his colleagues are free from all blame, for, as he reflects upon the unpunished outrages of margrave Ekkehard, he suggests that a rigid application of "divine law" and some unity of opinion among the bishops themselves would tend to correct the grievous state of affairs.[134] It was this same Ekkehard and his brother Herman whom Thietmar had difficulty in keeping from hunting in his precious forests, which, he says, he would not sell for sixty manors. When warnings failed to prevent preparations for a large hunting party, the bishop decided to investigate for himself, all the more since in this district, which he happened not to have visited since his consecration, a matter of some nine years, tithes were being withheld from him by the unsupervised remnant of his flock. On his way through the forest he was astounded to come upon the traps and nets of the insolent margrave's party; being unable to carry the equipment off with him, he simply ordered it put out of commission.[135] A skirmish threatened between Thietmar's guards and the margrave's, as they wanted to kill him, he says, but he was sufficiently well protected. Plainly this was a matter to inform the king of, and word was accordingly sent to Henry II at Mainz. The brothers promised peace but kept it none too well.[136] Indeed, 1018 was a bad year for Thietmar; it

---

devinxit sibi imperatorem . . . et ob hoc animositatem invidiamque plurimorum in se commovebat.

[134] Thietmar, IV, 73 (Kurze, 105): Si in hac provincia aliquid valeret lex divina, non sic insaniret secularis potencia. . . . Si consentiret voluntas coepiscoporum . . . non sic corroboraretur pertinax presumpcio iniquorum. . . . Ergo redeant ad unanimitatem, qui fideliter credant in unitatem, ut eo fortius confundant venenatam perversorum conspirationem. Cf. Hirsch, *JB H II*, 196-198.

[135] *Ibid.*, IX, 21 (Kurze, 252): Dehinc cum in ipso itinere predictum opus laqueis et retibus magnis firmatum viderem, obstipui, ac quid inde facerem cogitavi. Tandem, quia haec instrumenta nullatenus mecum vehere potui, ex hiis partem incidi protinus iussi.

[136] *Ibid.*, 22 (252): Uterque hanc (peace) non bene servavit. Namque homines VI flagellati ac depilati cum edificiis turpiter mutilatis approbant qualiter tanti seniores ab aliis precaveri debeant. Satellites eorum more subito in me non modo exarsere, verum etiam aliis melioribus nocuere.

afflicted him also with an outrageous armed invasion of his patrimony by one Aethelbert.[137]

Most of these Saxon bishops had the same difficulties as Thietmar with the raw Saxon nobility and their uncontrollable young followers. Bruno, count of Braunschweig, so hated Bernward of Hildesheim that he did not hesitate, pouncing upon one of Bernward's soldiers in the bishop's own presence, to scalp and murder him.[138] Swithger of Münster was bespotted with the blood of one of his stewards, murdered on the bishop's own property.[139] The revolt of the Werle house in 1017 embroiled both Thiedrich of Münster and Heribert, archbishop of Cologne, with the local counts.[140] Meinwerk of Paderborn was despoiled by bishop Thietmar's own nephew, Thietmar, brother of duke Bernhard.[141] When Arnulf of Halberstadt, being at Gernrode upon the invitation of the abbess Hedwig to celebrate the festival of Saint Ciriacius, ventured to censure a cleric whom he saw carrying a falcon about, the soldiers of margrave Gero chose to regard this as an insult to their chief and demanded an immediate apology.[142]

---

[137] Thietmar, IX, 19 (Kurze, 250): Eadem tempestate aecclesia mihi . . . commissa multum . . . sustinuit dampnum . . . dedecus magnum eidem [ac mihi] inlatum est ab ibrida Aethelberto, qui curtem meam invadere eamque frangere servili collectione presumpsit.

[138] *Ibid.*, 24 (253): Bernwardus in tantum a Brunone exosus est comite ut militem suum Rim nomine videret crine et tergo depravatum postque eundem secum iterantem ab Altmanno iuvene interfectum iacere.

[139] *Ibid. Vita Bernwardi*, c. 38, *MGH, SS* IV, 775: Quoscumque in exicium illius vel in dampnum Hildenesheimensis aecclesiae armare poterat, pro viribus institit, hinc praedis et rapinis passim bachatus in loca et homines episcopi. A. H. Lüntzel, *Geschichte der Diöcese und Studt Hildesheim*, I, 145.

[140] Thietmar, VIII, 49 (Kurze, 223): Thiedricus antistes et Hirimannus comes . . . de inani re mutuo certantes sua vastabant. *Ibid.*, IX, 26 (Kurze, 254): Heribertus a predicto comite (Herman) multa diu sustinuit incommoda. Hirsch, *JB H II*, III, 46, 113-115.

[141] *Ibid.*: Meinwercus . . . despoliatus est. *Vita Meinwerci*, c. 158, *MGH, SS* XI, 139: Ecclesia Herivordensis sicut Corbeiensis . . . Thietmari . . . invasione spoliata, propemodum fuerat destituta.

[142] Thietmar, VII, 36 (Kurze, 189): Hodie aut sacramento vos excusate aut seniori meo et nobis ad emendandum promittite. Hirsch, *JB H II*, II, 398.

The bishop was forced to guard his dwelling place and finally to hide from their search in the monastery, and was able to return home the following morning only under a strong guard of his own soldiers. This matter was also referred to the emperor, and Gero had to pay Arnulf 300 talents of silver and purge himself on oath, while the bullying soldiers were obliged to fast. The outcome of the dispute between another of the frontier margraves, Bernhard of Brandenburg, and archbishop Gero of Magdeburg was similar. The incident that provoked the dispute was a nocturnal attack on Magdeburg, in which one of the archbishop's soldiers was captured and another wounded.[143] Royal intervention resulted in a thorough humiliation of the margrave,[144] although even this did not put an end to all difficulties.[145] Eid of Meissen sorrowfully complains of the condition of his diocese: his dignity is gone, the demands of his clergy are not to be satisfied, the property of his church is plundered and laid waste.[146] It was much the same everywhere. The Bavarian bishop of Seben, Albuin, was attacked in the city by one of his vassals.[147] Thietmar tells of one of Henry II's political appointees to a Burgundian see who was obliged to run for his life through swamps from the hounds set upon him by Count Otto William, whom the king had deprived of his hold-

[143] Thietmar, VIII, 44 (Kurze, 219): Magadaburg a Bernhardo march [ione cum magna multitudine appetitur in nocte, et ibi miles archiepiscopi innocens capitur et alter vulneratur].

[144] *Ibid.*, 50 (223-224): [Gero archiepiscopus iussu imperatoris Bernhardum marchionem nudis pedibus emendationem sibi promittentem suscepit] . . . Ibi (Alstedt, Jan., 1017) promisit Geroni archiepiscopo Bernhardus marchio D argenti talenta pro dampni recompensatione inlati.

[145] *Ibid.*, 52 (225): In proxima autem die (Feb. 12, 1017) oritur (at Magdeburg) commocio inter socios archiantistis et Bernhardi marchionis, quae . . . et episcopo honorifice finitur. Cf. IX, 17 (249); Hirsch, *JB H II*, III, 46-47.

[146] Hirsch, *JB H II*, II, 898.

[147] Quidam nobilis vir . . . in quadam dissensione episcopalis sedis urbem . . . contra suum proprium dominum episcopum . . . ingressus est: quoted in Hirsch, *JB H II*, I, 61, p. 3.

ings in Burgundy.[148] Along the Rhine we have already seen Count Otto of Hammerstein ravaging the territory of the archbishop of Mainz in revenge for what he regarded as excessive interference in his private affairs,[149] and in behalf of the clergy of Worms bishop Burchard complains to Henry II of the injuries inflicted upon the residents of their properties by the local counts.[150]

There was withal in the position of advocate at least one legitimate means open to the nobility, aside from securing title to some small portion of the church lands, of sharing in the administration of the whole, and so of exercising a controlling influence upon its affairs. The advocate was the general lay representative and protector of the interests of an ecclesiastical foundation in its relation with the world outside. As the representative of royal justice he also acted as judge in all criminal cases involving the inhabitants of an immunity district. For these services he was paid with grants from church lands, with part of the proceeds from fines, and with such rights over the people of his district as the *droit de gite*. These advocacies were originally controlled largely by the families responsible in each case for the founding of the church or monastery, but with the increase in church holdings and with the corresponding necessity for

[148] Thietmar, VII, 28 (Kurze, 210): Episcopatum in hac regione quodam nobili viro dedit, de quo postea vix securus evasit. Namque Willehelmus, prepotens vir in hiis partibus, . . . fugientem solum canibus precepit inquiri . . . sic verus Dei famulus per incognita nemoris loca ad amicos perrexit fines. Hirsch, *JB H II*, III, 37.

[149] *Vita Heriberti*, c. 10, *MGH, SS* IV, 749: Is namque Otto episcopatum Moguntinum multa infestatione saepius pervagans ferro et igne populabatur. Bresslau, *JB H II*, III, 172, n. 3.

[150] *MGH, DD* III, 399, 400, No. 319: Burchardus . . . communi lamentacione pontificum et abbatum eiusdem provincie celsitudinem nostram adiit sese reclamando ob frequentem iniuriam ac legem iniustam a comitibus nostris familie sue ecclesie tali praesumpcione impositam . . . ut insultantem comitum presumpcionen nostra dominacione coherceremus. . . . Cuius peticionibus . . . adquiescentes . . . iubemus ut . . . comites nostri nullam familie sue ecclesie iniuriam vel iniusticiam post hoc inferre presumant.

an increase in the number of advocates, the bishops and abbots, in the face of demands for enlargement of the advocates' holdings, looked to making their appointment dependent entirely upon themselves. As in the process of feudalization these positions with their incomes tended to become hereditary, the threat to the independent churchman became worse. The consequent struggle for control of the advocacies thus becomes one more element of increasing friction between the bishops and the lesser nobility. While it is in general true that this struggle did not become intense until the later eleventh and twelfth centuries, we shall soon meet an uncommonly striking exemplification, as early as the tenth century, in the prolonged and desperate contest between the bishops and their advocates at Cambrai.[151]

D.

EPISCOPAL ELECTIONS

Despite all the provisions of canon law, there had never been a time, as we saw in our preliminary glance at the Merovingian kingdom, when the German kings had not exercised a more or less controlling influence over the personnel of the episcopate within their realms, nor was there any break in this policy under the Saxon line. Free elections were a special privilege granted by the king. By the right of patronage accruing to the founder and therefore virtual owner of a church (*Eigenkirchenwesen*),[152] the Saxon king and emperor actually exercised a patronage over the church that extended all the way from French regions eastward into Slav territory and from the Scandinavian north as far as the seat of the bishop of Rome himself. The contradiction between actual practice and what canon law prescribed was so great that Burchard of Worms, himself a royal appointee and a faithful servant of the crown, could draw up a collection of canons to assist the ignorant clergy of his diocese

[151] See pp. 86-88, also chapter III, pp. 128 ff. Cf. Nitzsch, I, 339-340; Werminghoff, 79-81; Hauck, III, 60-61.

[152] Werminghoff, 49, 55.

without even so much as alluding to the influence of the king upon episcopal elections,[153] while on the other hand Thietmar could say that kings and emperors alone regulated these matters and properly so.[154] Pope John X regarded the bestowal of a bishopric by the king as an ancient custom.[155] During the Saxon period there is very little to indicate that there was much opposition to this assertion of royal influence.[156] We need only recall the simple statement of the chronicler: "Hitherto one became a bishop not by election but by gift of the king."[157] In fact, the degree of influence exerted by Henry I was increased to a great extent by Otto I, not so much in manner as in substance: the king must have the final word.[158] By Henry II's time the king's control was if possible even firmer.[159]

---

[153] Koeniger, 69-71.

[154] Thietmar, I, 26 (Kurze, 16): Quin potius reges nostri et imperatores . . . hoc (disposition of bishoprics) soli ordinant, meritoque pre caeteris pastoribus suis presunt.

[155] Jaffé-Löwenfeld, *Regesta pontificum Romanorum*, 12, n. 3564, 3565: Cum prisca consuetudo vigeat, qualiter nullus alicui clerico episcopatum conferre debeat nisi rex cui divinitus sceptra collata sunt; Werminghoff, 63, n. 1; Janner, I, 289; Sommerlad, II, 230, n. 3.

[156] Hauck, IV, 436-437. Hauck insists that what tendency there was to maintain freedom of election was due to particularism rather than to opposition to the theory of royal control.

[157] Rupert, *Chron.*, 15, *MGH, SS* VIII, 267: Adhuc . . . non electione sed dono regis episcopus fiebat; Hauck, III, 404, n. 6.

[158] Dümmler, 528-529: Gebot er über die Vergebung der Bistümer fast ebenso unumschränkt wie über die Grafschaften. Hauck, III, 28-31.

[159] Otto I granted the privilege of free election to Halberstadt (937), Hamburg (937), Würzburg (941), and Minden (961). Otto II confirmed his father's grants and added Magdeburg (979) to the list. Otto III confirmed the privilege to Halberstadt and Hamburg. Henry II was opposed to this privilege and granted no new ones. In confirming the grants to Hamburg, Minden, Hildesheim and Fulda he added a significant phrase, either *aequo tamen regis consensu* or *salvo tamen regis sive imperatoris consensu*. Halberstadt received the only full confirmation of the privilege. In the confirmation for Paderborn it was entirely omitted. Hauck, III, 407-408; E. Laehns, *Die Bischofswahlen in Deutschland von 936-1056 unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der königlichen Wahlprivilegien und der Teilnahme des Laienelementes*, 18-24; Gerdes, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*, I, 572.

The actual procedure in the election of a bishop varied.[160] Elections were held in the episcopal city itself upon local nominations. In case the see was without the right of free election, this election was regarded as in fact a nomination to the king. In case the electors were careful in such cases to choose a candidate favorable to the crown, they might generally consider themselves possessed in practice of the privilege of free election. Sometimes royal confirmation was secured before proceeding to the election. To secure the king's confirmation a local embassy composed of clergy and laity, or even the proposed bishop himself, went to court. With the confirmation secured, a formal final election was held at home, or for it was substituted an enthusiastic reception of the new bishop in the city. Even in the case of sees enjoying the right of free election a report of the locally completed election was sent to court for formal confirmation.

As early as Otto I's reign we know of at least one instance that goes to show that the crown was unwilling invariably to confirm elections, if only to maintain unchallenged the right to reject.[161] By Henry II's time we find that even the formally acknowledged right of free election was not necessarily respected. Upon the death in 1021 of Heribert of Cologne, with whom he had been at constant odds, the king hastened to the city to put in his own candidate, although Cologne had the right of free election.[162] Two especially notable instances of his actual rejection of candidates already elected by chapters possessed of the same privilege are his insistence upon the election of his rich and agreeable friend Unwan to the see of Hamburg-Bremen and his interference in a series of

---

[160] The following paragraph is largely a summary of Laehns, *op. cit.*

[161] *Gesta epp. Camerac.*, c. 92, *MGH, SS* VII, 438: Otto I refuses to confirm election of Rotbert of Cambrai: Videns . . . quod, quia antea Wiboldum secundum suam electionem facili assensu eorum precibus attribuit, ideo etiam admittendi episcopum facultatem suo vellent fortasse arbitrio reservari: cum omni profecto refragatione eorum legationi effectum impertire negavit. Laehns, 13, n. 3.

[162] Laehns, 24; Bresslau, *JB H II*, III, 178-181.

successions at Magdeburg. In the former case bishop Liäwizo had pushed the candidacy of his vicar, the monk Oddo, a nephew of his predecessor Adaldag, and Oddo was in fact elected before his backer's death. The delegation that waited upon Henry II to secure his confirmation was flatly turned down and forced to accept with even a show of enthusiasm his own choice. In the latter case the elections of Tagino, Walter and Gero all give rise to attempts on the the part of the chapter to preserve its rights, at least according to the letter. Before the death of Giseler Henry had already determined upon Tagino as his successor, and had sent to Magdeburg his chaplain Wigbert to bring about his election. The chapter, headed by Walter, the provost of the cathedral, insisted upon their privilege and elected Walter himself archbishop. Henry's next envoy to the chapter, Arnulf, the bishop of Halberstadt, was informed that the chapter meant to maintain its right and that Walter had already been elected.[163] But the king, summoning Walter to a conference, won him over to the election of Tagino by "promising him much." [165] Upon Tagino's death Henry informed the chapter that they should not elect, but agree upon a candidate to be submitted to him. Again Walter was agreed upon. Thereupon, under the leadership of Thietmar, who protested that they should not permit their rights to be

[163] Thietmar, from *Ann. Quedl.*, VII, 29 (Kurze, 185): Oddo clericis comitantibus ac laicis supplex venit et regis gratiam sicut prius ad complecionem electionis per fidos intercessores postulat. Quos rex nullatenus audit sed capellano suimet Unwano cum laude advenientium, etsi non spontanea, episcopatum dedit.

[164] Thietmar paraphrases Lucan, *Pharsalia*, III, 145 ff.:

> Libertas, inquit, populi, quem regna coercent,
> Libertate perit, cujus servaveris umbram,
> Si, quicquid jubeare, velis.

in Walter's mouth to justify the chapter's action: V, 41 (Kurze, 130): Libertatem populi quem regna cohercent libertate dominantis perire, tantumque eius umbram servari, si cuntis eiusdem velit obtemperare preceptis.

[165] *Ibid.*: Multumque ei promittens.

flouted,[166] the chapter proceeded to a formal election, Thietmar casting the first vote.[167] After a three hour conference with Walter at Grona Henry II ordered that a new election be held at court upon the king's nomination. Upon Walter's death the chapter was reduced to a mere gesture in the election of Thietmar's young cousin Thiedrich, but they would have an election, even though they knew it would not be confirmed.[168] Upon learning of Walter's death the king, abandoning the siege of Metz to come to Saxony, made Gero archbishop and took Thiedrich into the royal chapel. In electing Gero the chapter made a point of reserving its right of free election for the future.[169]

The fact is that Henry II aimed at transferring the place of all elections from the episcopal city to court. As soon as a see fell vacant the court became a scene of considerable activity. There were various candidates and there were *intercessores* and *deprecatores*.[170] Delegations, it was well understood, should bring along to court something more than a

---

[166] Thietmar, VII, 2 (Kurze, 171): Senior meus (the king) imperet quod velit; vos autem, quod accepistis a Deo et antecessoribus suis videto ne perdatis.

[167] Thietmar is disarmingly frank in acknowledging that he supported Walter so strongly because he thought he might be of use to Merseburg: *ibid.*: Te autem . . . primus eligo . . . non caritate tua, sed utilitate certa [in te agnita]. Cf. Chapter VIII, n. 37.

[168] *Ibid.*, 14, (176): Nepotem meum . . . eligimus, non hoc ob iuventutem eius impleri sperantes, sed pro conservandae electionis gratia.

[169] Hauck, III, 400-404; Hirsch, *JB H II*, I, 276-178, II, 327-377; Richter-Kohl, 207-208. Hauck states that of the more than fifty bishops named during Henry's reign his own candidate was successfully opposed only once (*Vide* chap. III, p. 137).

[170] *Vita S. Wolfkangi*, c. 14, *MGH, SS* IV, 531: Omnes qui pro eodem episcopatu adipiscendo laborabant. *Vita Burchardi*, c. 4, *MGH, SS* IV, 834: Defuncto autem episcopo, statim aderant varii deprecatores imperatorem pro episcopatu invocantes. . . . Quo extincto adfuerunt iterum non pauci, aures imperatoris variis rogationibus pecuniaeque promissionibus pro episcopatu incessanter adimplentes. . . . Razo nominatus, maxime laborando et non pauca promittendo, virgam pastoralem accepit. Laehns, 33, n. 1.

good case for their candidates.[171] Adaldag of Hamburg-Bremen, Tagino of Magdeburg and Aribo of Mainz were active in support of their own candidates.[172] The nature of the pre-election agreements between Henry II and Thietmar of Merseburg, Meinwerk of Paderborn and Unwan of Hamburg-Bremen bears out the idea that he preferred wealthy bishops who would transfer some of their property to their new sees.[173] Unless we are led astray by authors who wish

[171] Sigimund of Halberstadt advises his chaplain as to the method to employ to succeed in the bishopric: Thietmar, I, 22 (Kurze, 14): Vade ad curtem regiam, sumens ex mea parte quae tibi sint ad haec necessaria, et acquire gratiam et auxilium ibi optime valentium. Is the monk Rotbert looking forward in part to the expenses of getting an imperial confirmation when he promises to the *primores Cameracensium*, who acclaim him *una eademque voluntate*: ut illum communi suffragio episcopum sibi ab imperatore fieri postularent, magna largitus eis munera, multo maiora spopondit (*Gesta epp. Camerac.*, c. 92, *MGH*, *SS* VII, 438: Laehns, 14, n. 1)? Charles the Simple complains of Hilduin of Liège that: ab Heinrico inimico nostro episcopium . . . expetiit . . . datis Heinrico suisque proceribus . . . auri argentique ponderibus (quoted in S. Sugenheim, *Staatsleben des Klerus im Mittelater*, I, 97, n. 32). Michael of Regensburg is persuaded to use the treasury of the monks of St. Emmeram in order to get a bishopric for his nephew: Arnold de S. Emmer., I, 17, *MGH*, *SS* IV, 554: Michael . . . cum pro episcopatu cuidam nepoti suo ab imperatore postulando palatii stationem petere decrevisset, xeniaque, quibus hoc se impetraturum sperabat, paravisset, persuasum est ei ab his, qui optabant apud principes ecclesiasticas venales fore dignitates, quatinus petitionem, quam facere vellet, thesauris Deo dilecti martiris Emmerammi subornaret. Cf. Janner, I, 345, n. 5. Gunther of Regensburg, while a monk of St. Emmeram, is reported to have been approached by Otto I with the following question: Quid mihi, frater, pro adipiscendo episcopatus honore vis dare? (Thietmar, II, 26 (Kurze, 35)). Henry II is approached with money to confirm the choice of Halberstadt electors, in 1023: Hauck, III, 403.

[172] Adam Bremensis, II, 6 (Schmeidler, 66). At the death of Wigbert of Merseburg, Henry was thinking of Ethelger for the bishopric: Thietmar, *Chron.*, VI, 39 (Kurze, 157): Quod cum regis familiaris Tagino resciret summopere rennuit et cum assidua supplicatione eo me cum gratia regis . . . vocavit. For Aribo at Bamberg, Christmas 1023, cf. Bresslau, *JB H II*, III, 281-284; Müller, *Aribo*, 30-32.

[173] Thietmar, VI, 40 (Kurze, 157): Interrogabar (Thietmar) ab eo (Tagino) iussu regis, si aliqua parte hereditatis meae ecclesiam vellem

their heroes to appear unambitious, some candidates had to be forced to accept a bishopric.[174] During the tenth century the practice of having the king at court invest the newly elected bishop with the staff became general. The exact nature and symbolism of the ceremony, and the question to what extent it involved as well an oath of loyalty and an oath of homage, are not clear.[175] At any rate, the giving over of the episcopal staff, which was brought by the delegations to court, symbolized the turning over of all rights and property of the see, spiritual and secular, to the new bishop, who by this formal intervention of the king was charged with administering them as a loyal servant of the crown, and with faithfully performing the episcopal *servitia* due to the crown.[176]

---

adiuvare meam. Thietmar's answer is circumspect: De hoc modo nil certi nec possum vel volo respondere. Si divino consensu et regis largitate vestra voluntas . . . hic adimplebitur, quicquid in hoc aut in rebus aliis . . . facere possum devotus implebo. Cf. the rather jovial conversation reported in the *Vita Meinwerci*, c. 11, *MGH, SS* XI, 112, between Henry II and Meinwerk over the latter's candidacy for Paderborn. When Henry proposes Paderborn, Meinwerk asks: Quid sibi episcopatus ille deberet, qui de bonis propriis excellentiorem construere valeret? Henry: "Te inopiae illius misericorditer subvenire desidero." Meinwerk: "Ego . . . ea spe et conditione episcopatum suscipiam." Adam Bremensis, II, 47 (Schmeidler, 107): Sermo est hunc (Unwan) per simoniacam pestem intronizatum, eo quod magnam hereditatem habuit. Cuius partem ipse invitus dimisit imperatori, partem vero alteram optulit ecclesiae suae.

[174] *Vita Burchardi*, c. 5, *MGH, SS* IV, 834: Imperator vehementer instans quasi vi ad suscipiendum eum compulerat. Alpert, *De Diversitate Temporum*, c. 12, *MGH, SS* IV, 706, quoted in Laehns, 37, n. 4: Cumque ille (Ansfrid of Utrecht) reniteretur, iamque se senem, in militaribus armis omni tempore vitae suae versatum, clericatus officia suscipere omnino absurdum videri contenderet, et rex vehementer instans vi ad suscipiendum compelleret. To be sure, some of these phrases sound suspiciously like mediaeval biographers' *clichés*.

[175] As we shall try to show in the next section, it seems entirely improbable that this early the relation entered into was feudal, that the bishop became vassal for a fief.

[176] Werminghoff, 619; Hauck, III, 54-56. Sommerlad, who seems to me to catch the spirit, at least, of the friendly intimacy that for the

A bishop might or might not be excessively rich, but except for the most unusual circumstances he must be of noble blood.[177] Henry II was the first German king since Louis the Pious to elevate men of ignoble birth to the episcopate, which he did in the case of five bishops.[178] Two of these, Gundekar and Walter, he made in succession bishops of Eichstätt, for the definite purpose of escaping further opposition to the creation of the see of Bamberg, such as he had had from his precious kinsman Megingaud.[179] When out of consideration for his vassals and clergy Gundekar hesitated to fulfil Henry's wishes, he heard sharp words from Henry, words such as we can well imagine this king's using to a refractory bishop who was at the same time a serf: "Gunzo, what's this I hear from you? Don't you know that I made you bishop of that place in order that, since I was not able to accomplish my desire with the previous bishop, as I would

most part prevailed between king and bishop, suggests, perhaps a little too specifically, that the relationship was the old German *Gefolgschaft*: Ein rein persönliches Verhältnis waltete zwischen dem König und seinen geistlichen Gefolgsleuten (II, 239-241).

[177] A. Schulte, *Der Adel und die Kirche im Mittelalter*, 73: Jedenfalls ist der deutsche Episcopat hocharistokratisch. The emphasis on noble birth is patent in all the sources; e.g., Udalrich of Augsburg, *Vita Oudalrici*, c. 1, *MGH, SS* IV, 385: excelsa prosapia Alamannorum ex nobilibus parentibus ortus; Henry of Augsburg, *ibid.*, c. 28, 418: ex nobilibus parentibus; Tagino of Magdeburg, Thietmar, VII, 5, (Kurze, 172): Nobiles genere et moribus amavit, ignobiles autem non contempsit sed in sua familiaritate non habuit; Walter of Magdeburg, *ibid.*, 15 (177): Ex nobilissimis natalibus genealogiam ducens; Meinwerk of Paderborn, *Vita Meinwerci*, cc. 11 and 5 resp., *MGH, SS* XI, 112, 108: Tam nobilium natalium magnitudine quam rerum et facultatum temporalium multitudine idoneum . . . regia stirpe genitus; Unwan of Hamburg-Bremen, Adam Bremensis, II, 47 (Schmeidler, 108): Clarissimo genere Immedingorum oriundus, preterea dives et largus; Reginald of Eichstätt, *Anon. Haser.*, c. 12, *MGH, SS* VII, 257: nobilis prosapia; Heribert of Eichstätt, *ibid.*, c. 27, 261: Nobilis genere, nobilior moribus.

[178] Schulte, 69.

[179] *Anon. Haser.*, c. 25, *MGH, SS* VII, 260: Eistetensem episcopatum ab initio usque tunc a nobilibus et summis viris habitum ingeniosus imperator tunc demum servili personae addixit et Gunzoni cuidam . . . dedit. *Ibid.*, c. 26, 261: Walthero eiusdem conditionis episcopo.

have expected with a kinsman, with you, being what you are, I might achieve it without delay? If you wish to keep either the bishopric or my favor, take care that I never again hear any such thing out of you."[180] Gundekar resisted no longer, and a second serf on the episcopal throne at Eichstätt assured the permanence of the result. Godehard of Hildesheim, to all appearances from the class of *ministeriales*, got his bishopric because of his excellent record as a monastic administrator.[181] Durand of Liège was outstanding as a scholar and had even been recommended for Bamberg.[182] The fifth exception to the tradition that only nobles became bishops was Thietmar of Osnabrück.[183] Members of the royal family were well represented in the episcopate.[184] Ducal[185] and county families, margraves and *Pfalzgrafen*

---

[180] *Anon. Haser.*, c. 25, *MGH, SS* VII, 260: Gunzo, quid hoc audio de te? An ignoras, quia propterea episcopum te loci illius feci ut, quia voluntatem meam, cum priore, utpote socio meo, perficere non poteram, tecum, qui eiusmodi es, sine dilatione perficiam? Cave, ne unquam tale quid audiam ex te, si vel episcopatum vel gratiam meam velis retinere. Schulte, 70; Hirsch, *JB H II*, II, 83-85.

[181] *Vita Godehardi prior*, c. 1, *MGH, SS* XI, 170: Pater namque eius . . . ex eiusdem (Oberaltaich) monasterii familia extitit oriundus. Schulte, 71.

[182] *Anselmi Gesta epp. Leod.*, c. 36, *MGH, SS* VII, 209: Durandus, natus quidem ex humili genere servorum memorati Godescalci praepositi.

[183] Thietmar, VIII, 67 (Kurze, 233): Servus sancti Mauricii (Magdeburg).

[184] William of Mainz, Bruno of Cologne, Henry of Trier, Poppo I and II of Würzburg, Liudolf of Osnabrück, Dietrich I and II of Metz, Berengar of Verdun, Berengar and Erluin of Cambrai, Bruno of Augsburg, Megingaud of Eichstätt, Eberhard of Bamberg, Pilgrim of Cologne and Aribo of Mainz. Hauch, III, 31; Laehns, 48-50; Uhlirz, 118; Hirsch, *JB H II*, II, 5, 69, 70, 72; Richter-Kohl, 237-238; Möser, II, 11 ff.; Müller, *Aribo*, 1-7.

[185] The Billungers had special influence on Verden. Bishop Amelung was a brother of duke Herman, and his successor, Bruno, a nephew. Harold of Salzburg was a nephew of old duke Arnulf. Udalrich of Augsburg was an uncle of the duke of Swabia. His efforts to keep the bishopric in the family by having his nephew Adalbero succeed him bear witness to the feudal tendency as it affected the episcopate. Before Udalrich's death Adalbero had taken over all the secular affairs of the

bishopric, and, to make it perfectly clear that he was to succeed, had bound all the military of the bishopric to him as well as all the officialdom, and had even gone so far as to carry publicly the bishop's staff. *Vita Oudalrici*, c. 22, *MGH, SS* IV, 408: Ferulam episcopalem publice portare praesumit, ut eis (chapter) tota spes adquirendi episcopatus adimeretur. The bishops at the Synod of Ingelheim in September 972 revolted at the idea of Adalbero's taking over the bishopric during the life of the reigning bishop, but they showed no hesitation in leaving Augsburg to the family, since they were willing to agree that he should succeed. It seems to me significant also that Otto I, far from raising any objection to the whole procedure, had even previously agreed to it, and at Ingelheim inducted Adalbero into the position of Udalrich's vicar in all episcopal affairs. *Vita Oudalrici*, c. 23, 409: Et tunc cum consensu aliorum antistitum fecit ab imperatore Adalberoni commendari ir eorum praesentia procurationem sui habere et sub ipso totius episcopatus cautam dispositionem in omnibus adimplere.

There was, of course, no doubt of the loyalty of Adalbero or of Udalrich to Otto I. But to those who regard as steps in a far-seeing policy all the acts of the Saxon emperors, this procedure must seem highly inconsistent and dangerous, for it suggests that Ottonian policy may have been far more opportunistic than we have been led to believe. On the surface this seems clever: bind a bishopric closely to the crown and win over an important family. At the same time, royal support is given to a feudal tendency, and who could say how long the bishopric or the family would remain unquestionably loyal? Apparently family interests had to be compromised with. As a matter of fact, the bishopric did not after all go to Adalbero, who died in the spring of 973. But it did go to one who was related to the ducal house of Swabia and Bavaria, and to one who for a while was engaged in rebellious activities, and the circumstances under which he came to the bishopric, illustrating again the necessity for the crown to placate the powerful Bavarian ducal family, suggest that we know only too little of the actual prelude to episcopal elections, in so far as they represent family ambitions.

At the death of Udalrich the chapter, advocate and vassals of Augsburg made an attempt to get into contact with the moving court concerning a successor. After the death of his nephew Udalrich had decided upon the abbot of Fulda. The delegation travelled the good distance to Worms, where they came upon duke Burchard, who convinced them that they should go back home: the court was far away, things were very expensive in those regions (*omnia supra modum cara*), and besides, a *Reichstag* was soon to be held at Erinstein (Erstein), of which the duke would inform the chapter in due time. As a matter of fact, the duke was manoeuvering to prevent this very contact, in order that Henry, his own cousin, a son of count Burchard, who himself

prominent in the locality, were influential in securing sees for members of their families, although the dukes were apparently much less strenuous in their efforts to control nominations to their bishoprics than one would suppose, in view of the accepted theory of the relationship between king and duke.[186] Often the noble bishop was called from the regular clergy.[187] The chief step in the *cursus honorum* that

married into the Bavarian house, should get the see. The Augsburg delegation were duped and returned home. When they set out again for the *Reichstag*, they were met at Baden with the information that the emperor and his advisers and duke Burchard had chosen Henry to be their bishop, and that he would soon come to them. To date Otto II seems to have had no part in this business. Henry appeared with his own soldiers and with some of the duke's, and demanded an election on the spot. The delegation demanded a regular chapter meeting, and they all returned to Augsburg together. Here another messenger, pretending to act as an envoy of the king in Henry's behalf, made his appearance. The chapter meeting was spent partly in reading the canon law on episcopal elections, but when Henry displayed a meek attitude, *promittens eis . . . in posterum omnigenae commoditatis inpensionem*, he was elected. Otto II, presented with the *fait accompli* at Bothfeld in September, was in no position to oppose it. It is worth noting also that Henry's candidacy was supported by *quibusdam militibus qui ab eo beneficia sua augeri astuta arte cupiebant. Vita Oudalrici*, c. 28, *MGH, SS* IV, 416-415; Uhlirz, *JB O II*, 35-38.

[186] In opposition to the ducal family in Bavaria, the Aribone, counts in the Chiemgau, supporters of the crown, were represented at Salzburg by Odalbert and Frederick, at Passau by Pilgrim, at Brixen by Albuin; the related Carinthian Spannheimer house was represented at Salzburg by Hartwich. Pilgrim of Cologne was related to the Aribone house. In Saxony the counts of Stade and Walbeck had two bishops at Münster. Thiedrich and Siegfrid, and Thietmar of Merseburg was Siegfrid's brother. Hildeward of Halberstadt was a son of the Werle count Erich. The Saxon margraves were represented by Gunther of Salzburg, son of margrave Ekkehard of Meissen, and Gero of Cologne, brother of margrave Thietmar. Bernward's father was a *Pfalzgraf* in Saxony; Unwan, an Immendinger; Meinwerk, an uncle of duke Bernhard; Udo of Strassburg, the son of count Rothard. Gerdes, *Die Bischofswahlen in Deutschland under Otto dem Grossen in den Jahren 953 bis 973*, 7-38; Laehns, 52-82; *Vita Bernwardi*, c. 1, *MGH, SS* IV, 758; Dümmler, 179-180.

[187] Abbots or monks from St. Emmeram (Gunther of Regensburg, Boso of Merseburg), Reichenau (Othwin of Hildesheim), Corvey

led to a bishopric or an archbishopric, however, was experience at court as an active member of the royal chapel or chancellery. The chancellors in particular normally expected to get a bishopric as their reward for long and faithful service.[187] Indeed, the political character of the episcopate is nowhere more clearly reflected than in the frequency with which the Saxon emperors made bishops of their chaplains and chancellors.[188]

E.

OTTONIAN GENEROSITY TO THE CHURCH

In the attempt to find a formula for the internal development of church and state in the tenth and early eleventh centuries, the actual course of events seems to have been somewhat distorted to fit the scheme. There has been propounded,

(Folcmar of Paderborn, Bruno of Verden), St. Maurice at Magdeburg (Anno of Worms, Othwin of Hildesheim), Weissenburg (Adalbert of Magdeburg), Fulda (Hatto II of Mainz, Erkanbald of Mainz, Branthog of Halberstadt), Oberaltaich (Godehard of Hildesheim), Bergen (Siegfrid of Münster): from Gerdes, *Bischofswahlen*, 18 *et passim;* the *Jahrbücher* of Dümmler, Uhlirz, Hirsch, Bresslau, Richter-Kohl; and Hauck, III, 403, *et passim.*

[188] Dietrich, the chancellor for Italy after Pilgrim's accession to Cologne, had already been a member of the chapel. A grant of property to him in 1006 well illustrates one of the uses to which bishoprics were put; the property is given: ea videlicet ratione, ut quandiu absque episcopatu vixerit, fruatur et teneat. Si autem aut episcopatum adeptus fuerit aut ex hac vita migraverit, cuncta redeant aut in manus nostras aut in illorum quibus hereditario iure concedere volumus(*MGH, LL* III, 136, No. 110); Bresslau, *JB H II*, III, 196. Waitz, *Verfassungsgeschichte*, VI, 273, n. 3, quotes from Herbord's life of Otto III: Multi ergo nobiles et magni viri, cognati et filii principum, in curia degebant spe promotionis.

[189] Gerdes, *Geschichte d. d. Volkes*, I, 568, speaks of a large majority of the bishops as coming from the royal chapel. I doubt if this were easy to substantiate. Henry II made six members of his *Hofklerus* (out of ten vacancies) archbishops: Hauck, III, 406-407. Of twenty-five examples of nominations from the chapel culled at random from this period, exclusive of Lorraine and Italy, eleven were for the five archbishoprics and the remaining fourteen were for twelve different bishoprics. G. Dehio, *Geschichte des Erzbistums Hamburg-Bremen bis*

and until recently generally accepted, a theory of the ownership by the crown of all church property, which regards the abundant grants of land to the church from the royal fisc and the bestowal of what later came to be specified as regalian rights, as evidence of a far-seeing policy on the part of the Ottonian dynasty to utilize rights and properties that it was itself in no position to exploit by turning them over to the secular and regular branches of the church to administer in the interests of the state, thus excluding the lay nobility from this favor. At the same time it is always recognized that, whatever the cause, this dissipation of royal property and this giving away of what were sovereign rights was a very important, in fact the first important, chapter in the transformation of episcopal properties into ecclesiastical territorial states and of the bishops into ecclesiastical territorial princes. Accordingly, the necessary link between the presumed ownership by the state of all church property and rights and the actual emergence of the independent ecclesiastical prince, sovereign of a territorial state, must be the investiture of the bishop or abbot by the crown as a vassal with all the rights and property of the church or monastery, the later *temporalia*, as a fief. Plainly, some way had to be found to reconcile the contradiction between the transcription to the early mediaeval German kingdom of the theory of the absolute monarchy, that there is no such thing as private property within the state, and the actual result of a long, varied and complicated process that more and more tended to make all public properties and rights essentially private.

According to the theory, then, the so-called property rights of the state in the property of the churches of the state (*Eigentum des Reiches am Reichskirchengute*) are an out-

---

zum Ausgang der Mission, I, 105: Die königliche Kapelle war . . . ein grosses Seminar für künftige Bischöfe, eine Erziehungsanstalt freilich noch mehr für Staatsdienst als für den Kirchendienst. Gerdes, *Bischofswahlen*, 38: Eine eigentliche Pflegstätte der Bildung und Vorschule für die politische Verwaltung.

growth, if not a corollary, of the idea of the patrimonial church (*Eigenkirche*). Every church must have its lord in law, its legal representative (*Rechtsträger*), since German law did not recognize an institution as a juridical personality. Churches founded by a lay or ecclesiastical person are amenable to control over the presentation of clergy and to supervision over their endowment by the lay founder and his heirs, or by the ecclesiastical founder and his successors. Such foundations, dependent on a patron and not on the crown, are *Mediatekirchen;* only indirectly are they subject to use in the interests of the state (*reichsmittelbar*), as, for example, when they are used to fulfill demands made upon their patrons by the crown. All churches not so founded, or founded on and endowed with crown property, have as their legal patron the king; they are patrimonial churches of the state (*Reichseigenkirchen*) and are directly dependent on the state (*reichsunmittelbar*). These include most of the bishoprics and archbishops and a large number of monasteries and nunneries, as well as other foundations. The king, as patron, has the right to determine who shall head these institutions. Moreover, these churches with their property and their privileges are actually the property of the state (*Reichsgut*). Bishops and abbots of such foundations are state officials, administering what is really state property. No property and privileges of these state churches (*Reichskirchen*), no matter how acquired, are theirs in full proprietary right; they become a part of the property of the state in patrimonial churches of the state. Especially is this true of property and sovereign rights granted to the church out of the royal fisc: what is turned over is not actual ownership but merely possession (*Besitz*) and the right to exploit (*Nutzeigentum*), or, as Ficker puts it, "ein dauerndes Recht auf Besitz und Genuss." All properties and rights of *Reichskirchen* are "Pertinenzen einer dem Reiche gehörenden Hauptsache im Obereigenthume des Reiches," and since these *Reichskirchen* themselves own many patrimonial churches of their own, "so wurde darnach die Hauptmasse des

Kirchengutes überhaupt Reichseigenthum gewesen sein." The crown then, from this point of view, is not so much liberal as practical. The right to use what it can not use itself it transfers to agencies that it owns anyway, namely the *Reichskirchen,* and in return is entitled to demand and receive services (*servitia*).[190]

This nice theory has been most recently challenged by Pöschl,[191] not in so far as it concerns such churches and, more commonly, monasteries as we know were founded by the crown on crown property, which were, of course, subject to the same rights of the patron as any other foundation and belonged with their entire endowment to the property of the state, but in so far as it has been extended to the remaining and older churches, especially the bishoprics, for which he holds that this theory simply cannot be demonstrated. Therefore the legal competence of these—and they were the most important—churches (*Rechtsfähigkeit*) must be assumed. Properties given to the church became church property outright, handed over to the church on the same terms as those on which the state had held them. Church property was no longer state property at all. If it served in many ways the interests of the state, none the less the basis of the power of the state over the church is to be found in the number of specific rights that the state reserved to itself, and not in any all-inclusive abstraction.[192] And so the inherent incompatibility between *imperium* and *dominium* in a feudal state re-

---

[190] J. Ficker, *Über das Eigentum des Reichs am Reichskirchengute,* SBWA, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, vol. 72, 55-105, 381-406; Werminghoff, 56-77; Fisher, *The Medieval Empire,* I, 253-258.

[191] A. Pöschl, *Die Regalien der mittelalterlichen Kirchen. Festschrift der Grazer Universität für 1927.*

[192] *Ibid.,* 91-92: Bei den Reichsbistümern der Ottonen und Salierzeit ist Rechtsfähigkeit . . . anzunehmen. . . . Es trat nicht etwa irgend eine bleibende Zugehörigkeit dieser Güter zum Reiche ein. Das Reichskirchengut als solches war nicht Reichsgut. Es diente nur vielfach den Zwecken des Staates. . . . Die Herrschaft . . . ist daher nur aus Einzelheiten und nicht durch abstrakte Konstruktion zu erkennen.

mains irreconcilable, and the difficulty remains as insoluble in theory as the German emperors certainly found it in fact.

One must be careful not to introduce into the tenth century legal concepts formed only centuries later. For the early medieval period there was no clear cut distinction between private and public law,[193] and accordingly there was no definite legal concept of what constituted the *regalia*. The sharp definition of this term came only as a result of the argument arising out of the investiture struggle and the renewed study of Roman law. What later were regarded as regalian rights were considered in the tenth century only as privileges to be granted like many others by the king only, and essentially as mere sources of income (*Vermögensstücke*). Nor did the fact that these grants of sources of income came from the king distinguish them at all from the other wealth of the church.[194] There were no *regalia*, no *spiritualia;* there were only church property and privileges. Nor is there any disagreement over the character of the grants on the part of the crown to the church at this early date. They were not ordinarily feudal grants, but grants in full ownership; in at least one case even rights previously held as a benefice were granted outright to the church.[195] There was no ecclesiastical

[193] Pöschl, 21-22: War doch überhaupt dem früheren Mittelalter ein grundlegender, grundsätzlicher Unterschied zwischen privatem und öffentlichem Rechte fremd.

[194] *Ibid.*: Die später als Regalien bezeichneten Gegenstände reihen sich restlos und vollkommen den übrigen Vermögensstücken an. The same is true for the later so-called *spiritualia*. D. W. Lowis, *The History of the Church in France, A. D. 950-1000*, refers to the regalia as "an endowment of land which made the bishop a landed magnate" (219) and states that "the bishop ranked as a duke, the presbyter as a count" (219), and "the bishop . . . in his turn let out land to seculars called advocates" (224). These are certainly inaccurate and misleading statements to come from a doctoral thesis of the University of London.

[195] *MGH, DD* IV, 144, No. 101: Comitatum Tridentinum cum omnibus suis pertinentiis . . . quibus eum duces comes sive marchiones huc usque beneficii nomine habere visi sunt, sancte Tridentine ecclesie . . . in proprium . . . damus. Pöschl, 22, n. 50.

vassalage. The investing of a new bishop or abbot with the *regalia* of his church or monastery by means of the scepter, which signified that he thus became the king's vassal, is all a matter of the thirteenth century.[196] For the tenth we have to do with the symbolical transmission of the episcopal staff, the ring being added to the ceremony only towards the middle of the eleventh century. We have also to do with an oath of fidelity on the part of the new bishop. But this is not to be interpreted in the light of a later strict feudal law, even though it be interpreted in the light of a developing one. Our bishops we find in a position of loose, ill-defined, personal dependence on a king who is the recognized possessor of certain potential or actual sources of income, which he can be persuaded or forced to part with in return for their recognition of his right to control appointments to their offices and to receive from them generous contributions for the maintenance of the government in all its functions. This amounts to a tacit understanding depending for its strength to a large degree upon the personality of the ruler, the warmth of devotion he is able to inspire, and the extent to which he is willing to go in hearkening to the persistent suggestions of the bishop as to the needs of his church. It seems impossible to fix the relationship definitely by any sort of law.[196a]

None the less, the fact must be emphasized that these grants to the upper clergy, for our purposes to the bishops, do form the basis for the development of that distinctive German political entity, the ecclesiastical territorial state. Despite all considerations of Ottonian policy, no matter whether for the time being the bishops were an important aid in the preservation of a moderately strong monarchy, they were at the same time accumulating landed wealth and political powers fundamentally destructive to the growth and persistence of

---

[196] R. Boerger, *Die Belehnungen der deutschen geistlichen Fürsten.*

[196a] Subsequent to the writing of the above I have come across the statement of G. v. Below (*Kaiserpolitik*, 63): Ebenso fehlte der Herrschaft über die Prälatur die verfassungsmässige Festlegung; auch hier liegt nur ein tatsächliches Verhältnis vor.

a genuinely strong monarchy. This development in the church was of a piece with that among the secular nobility. Indeed, any one that looks beneath the outward cooperation of king and bishop must recognize rather the identity of aim of secular and ecclesiastical nobility during this period. For the development of monarchial institutions the Ottonians were laying dangerous, even fatal, foundations. And this, I think, could justly be maintained in the light only of the tenth century, without contemplating in advance the disruptive effects of the struggle between church and state during the succeeding centuries.

The development of the ecclesiastical territorial state was in no respect everywhere identical.[197] At the same time it presents similar general features. The transformation of the bishop from private landowner to ruler possessed of sovereign rights over a definite geographical area was a process of centuries. The first step therein was the acquisition of dominion within the episcopal city: the bishop must become *Stadtherr*. Such an achievement was facilitated if the city itself grew up on episcopal property, although this in itself was not essential. His strength depended upon the extent of his land holdings, since they determined the size of the military that he was able to support, but actual dominion in the city and beyond was derived from the grant of certain public powers by the crown. Chief of these was the judicial power (*Gerichtsbann*), which came with immunity and with grants of county rights, and which could be—and in our period was—extended beyond the limits of the actual property of the bishop himself. In addition, grants of the right to set up markets, usually entailing the right to collect tolls and to coin money,[198] not only enabled the bishop definitely to pro-

[197] Hauck, *Die Entstehung der geistlichen Territorien*, Abhandlungen der Königlichen Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, vol. 57, 647-669.

[198] These three usually but not necessarily went together. E.g., *MGH, DD* II, 564, No. 153: concessimus . . . mercatum construendum cum omnibus appenditiis quae ad hoc pertinent, id est moneto, teloneo . . . cunctisque aliis quae ad predictum mercatum nominari . . .

mote urban development, but brought him an added income and extended his jurisdiction, which in particular enhanced his position within the episcopal city. The assumption of the duty of fortifying the city brought with it subsequently the rights involved in keeping the fortifications in repair. Grants of forests with the *Wildbann*, i.e., the exclusive right to hunt and fish, set off these areas under the bishop's lordship.[199] County grants, in case the county contained the episcopal city, enlarged his jurisdiction over the city because they included the *Blutbann*, i.e., the so-called high jurisdiction (*hohe Gerichtsbarkeit*), or jurisdiction in criminal cases (*causae maiores*). Later grants for neighboring counties would likewise extend episcopal dominion. These are the chief steps in the development, and they had all taken firm root by the end of Henry II's reign. The accumulation of these rights had gone on apace during the whole Ottonian period, along with the enlargement of landholdings. When they were held over a long period, grouped together as *temporalia* and more particularly as *regalia*, granted by king or emperor as a fief, another step had been taken towards that time when the Archbishop of Mainz could call the citizens *"omnes burgenses nostri,"* and the bishop of Münster could refer to *"terra*

---

possunt; F. Friedenburg, *Deutsche Münzgeschichte*, 113. Friedenburg states (102) that by 1000 all the German bishoprics had coining rights; Gerdes, *Geschichte*, I, 396-397; Pöschl, 14, n. 6. Market, minting and toll rights were granted with every other public jurisdiction to Passau, *MGH, DD* II, 732, No. 306: Eiusdem civitatis mercatum monetam bannum teloneum et totius publice rei districtum, tali tenore ut predictus presul . . . suique successores omnem publicam rem hactenus nobis in eadem civitate . . . pertinenti habeat et firmiter infra civitatem et extra perpetualiter teneat. Pöschl, 15, n. 9; Hirsch, *JB H II*, I, 58; Hauck, III, 61-62; *Geistl. Territ.*, 655-656; Gerdes, *Geschichte*, I, 391-392; Nitzsch, I, 343, 374, 378-389; Thompson, *Feudal Germany*, 43; Sommerlad, II, 245 ff.

[199] E.g., Otto I to Utrecht, 944 *MGH, DD* I, 143-144, No. 62: Interdicimus, ut nullus comitum aliorumve hominum in pago forestensi quod est in comitatu Everhardi, cervos, ursos, capreas, apros, bestias insuper que Teutonica lingua eto aut scelo (elk) appellantur, venari absque prelibate cathedre presulis permissu presumat. Cf. Pöschl, 16, n. 11.

nostra."[200] At least grants of immunity were possessed as early as the end of the ninth century by practically all of the German bishops, but, while these excluded from the bishop's territory all public officials, especially counts, and turned over to him the crown income of the immunity district, they by no means constituted an exemption for the free inhabitants of immune territory from the jurisdiction of the count's court. The bishop's advocate, although he already exercised the jurisdiction of a landlord over his servile peasantry, had to appear before the local count's court to answer for all cases involving freemen or immune lands, and any criminal case at all came before the count. What the bishops were striving for during the Ottonian period, and what they got, was an enlargement of their immunity grants, which first of all brought them unlimited jurisdiction over all cases involving inhabitants of their holdings within and without the episcopal city. They then strove to include within their complete jurisdiction regions within which they held some territory (there are grants of this kind also). To all intents and purposes this involved the complete exclusion of the count from any jurisdiction whatever. Criminal jurisdiction was not exercised at this time by the bishop himself, because of the prohibitions of church law, but entrusted to the advocate, who received from the king the right to judge crimnial cases, i.e., the *Blutbann.*[201] With the extension of this unlimited juris-

[200] Hauck, *op. cit.*, 662, n. 99, 672, n. 157.

[201] The judicial ambitions of the tenth century bishop are illustrated by the following forged document of Passau (cited by Hauck, *ibid.*, 659-660, n. 80), purporting to be a grant of Arnulf of September 9, 898: Ut in prememorata urbe . . . nullus iudex publicus vel quislibet vir ex curiali dignitate placitum aut comitatum habere presumat vel omnino super familiam aut suburbanos aliqua secularia sive iudiciaria in ea exerceat negotia, sed aduocatus atque patronus sanctae Dei casae sub ditione illius sedis episcopi constitutus, quaecunque illic sunt disponenda, ipse et non alius ordinet et examinet. The document of Otto II, *MGH DD* II, 38, No. 29, for Magdeburg grants: ne quis comes aut iudex vel vicarius publicus in Magadaburgensi civitate vel territoriis eius aliquam potestatem aut bannum habeat, nisi advocatus quem archiepiscopus illius aecclesiae secundum suum sibi libitum elegerit, et negotiatores vel

diction to whole counties or groups of counties, the bishop reached a limit in one line of development[202] But his troubles

---

Iudaei ibi habitantes, omnesque familiae lidorum vel colonorum vel servorum vel Sclavorum illuc pertinentes a nullo alio nisi eodem advocato secundum leges constringantur vel iudiciales sententias patiantur. Henry II adds in his confirmation of this grant, *MGH, DD* III, 233, No. 199: Ut . . . prescriptae aecclesiae advocatus inibi placitum ad leges et iusticias faciendas habeat. Et si, quod absit, isdem advocatus aliquid ibi injuste aut praesumptuose contra legem fecerit, in nostro palatino colloquio id deducatur; Hirsch, *JB H II*, II, 280, n. 1. Among bishoprics that were granted judicial powers of counts within their holdings were Magdeburg, Mainz, Cologne, Chur, Worms, Minden, Bremen, Strassburg; bishoprics in possession of rights of the count for one or more counties, Freising, Würzburg, Paderborn, Worms, Hildesheim, and Lorraine and Italian bishoprics to be mentioned. Cf. the grant of the two counties of Waldsassen and Rangau to Würzburg in 1000, *MGH, DD* II, 795, No. 366: Quos (the counties) cum omni districto placito et banno nostro imperiali lege et iudicum iudicio, nihil de his quae comites sive aliquis mortalium de placitis habere debuerunt excipientes, cum omni utilitate rei publicae sanctissimis martyribus prescriptis in proprium tradidimus, et de nostro iure et dominio in iu[s] et dominium . . . episcopi suorumque successorum . . . transfudimus, eo scilicet . . . tenore ut idem . . . pontifex . . . omnesque sui successores imperpetuum prenominatos comitatus qualitercumque voluerint ordinent et quos velint comites ponant. Pöschl, *Regalien*, 17-18; O. Müller, *Die Entstehung der Landeshoheit der Bischöfe von Hildesheim*, 2-8; Hauck, III, 59-64, 409-410, *Geistl. Territ.*, 659-666; Werminghoff, 78-83; Meister, 127-128; Gerdes, I, 460-461, 506; Nitzsch, I, 339-340, 360-362; Boos, I, 194-195, 229 ff.; Waitz, VI, 452-462; Dümmler, 532-533; Hirsch, *JB H II*, II, 280; Thompson, *Feudal Germany*, 41-42.

[202] K. F. Stumpf, *Die Reichskanzler vornehmlich des X, XI und XII Jahrhunderts;* Böhmer-Ottenthal, *Die Regesten des Kaiserreichs unter dem sächsischen Hause;* Seelig, 24-27; Böhmer, *Willigis*, 71; Hauck, III, 58.

I do not know whether a thorough analysis has been made of the 1,858 documents listed in Stumpf for the period 919-1024, which would look toward the determination of the following points. 1. How many grants were made and, so far as it is possible to determine, how much land went out of the royal fisc to bishops, cathedral churches or chapters, abbots, monasteries, other ecclesiastical foundations, and to seculars, and is there any significance in the proportions? 2. The same for all other forms of property grants (forts, monasteries, parish churches, chapels, etc.), including all grants of so-called sovereign rights. (These

were not over. The advocacy, held by local families and often enough by dispossessed counts themselves, remained a threat to the bishop's independence, because, as a large landholder who naturally endeavored to fuse the church holdings in his keeping with his private holdings, and as an official possessed of extensive judicial power, the advocate might easily come to overshadow the bishop himself. And so there was still to be fought the battle with the advocates, for whom, when once the victorious church had relaxed its prohibition of the exercise by the clergy of the *Blutbann*, were to be substituted the episcopal *ministeriales*.[203]

---

two types of grants are, of course, far more numerous than all others [cf. nn. 198, 199] put together.) 3. How are these grants divided among Italy, Lorraine and the rest of Germany, and is there any significance in the proportions? Neither do I happen to know of the existence of maps which for every episcopal seat and monastery would, so far as is possible from what is known, indicate territorial expansion through royal or other gifts or through exchange. (Lacking such information I can only point to the unprecedented frequency of the grants; cf. Gerdes, I, 535; Thompson, *Feudal Germany*, 51, 343.)

A summary of the grants of Otto I (Stumpf lists 491 documents of Otto I, of which sixty-six are suspected) to German bishoprics, as made by Seelig, gives a total of seventy-five documents for twenty-five different bishoprics, of which fifty-four are new grants of property and privileges and twenty-one confirmations of previous grants. The proportion in Stumpf of the number of grants to bishoprics, monasteries and seculars respectively is approximately for

Otto II (Stumpf lists 324 documents, of which 29 are suspected): German grants, 8.4:9.8:1.5; Italian grants, 1.0:2.6:.3.

Otto III (Stumpf lists 936 documents, of which 38 are suspected): German grants, 8.3:10.2:2.4; Italian grants, 3.8:5:1.6.

Henry II (Stumpf lists 533 documents, of which 25 are suspected): German grants, 19.6:15.3:1.1; Italian grants, 2.4:5:.5.

The proportion between grants to churchmen and to seculars is significant. It will also be noticed that under Otto II and Otto III generosity, as measured by the number of documents, is greater towards monasteries than towards bishoprics. The reverse is true, however, for Henry II.

[203] See p. 67 and chap. III, pp. 128 ff.

F.

SERVITIA EPISCOPORUM

If we abandon the theory of *Eigentum des Reiches am Reichskirchengut*—and we have seen how little there is to substantiate it for the tenth and early eleventh centuries—there remains no regulation in law of the services to be rendered by the bishop in acknowledgment of his obligation to the crown. As the basis for *servitia episcoporum* we then have left only the control of episcopal elections by the crown and the feudal ambitions of the bishops, which could be realized only by cooperation with the crown. I hope to make clear that upon this basis everything that we know of the *servitia* during the period of the Saxon dynasty can be accounted for. At any rate, there can be no doubt that the arrangement, whatever it was in theory, worked in practice; the bishops and, at least in appearance and for the time being, the kings got what they wanted from each other.

We owe most of our scanty knowledge of the actual institution of episcopal *servitia* in this period to an elaboration, written in the second half of the eleventh century by a monk of the monastery of Herrenried, of the exceptional qualities possessed by that Megingaud whom we have already had occasion to mention, who had been bishop of Eichstätt during the reign of his kinsman Henry II. The writer tells how Henry II sent ahead a messenger to Eichstätt with specifications as to the *servitia* to be tendered to him on his way to Regensburg. When the messenger concluded with the prescription of a vast quantity of wine, Megingaud's patience gave out. "Your Lord," he said, "is obviously crazy." How could he expect from a poor bishop who had barely enough for himself such services as a king might render? As for the wine, he had only one poor little hogshead, which was meant only for the mass, and "by St. Willibald," said he, "not a single drop of this wine shall go down your master's throat." To

be sure, he did send some valuable gifts to the emperor.[204] Whether or not we accept all the details of this picturesque story, it is at least clear that there was no fixed *servitium* to be rendered to the king, who made his own demands, demands which any bishop might well regard as excessive and for which a stubborn bishop might risk a substitute.[205] The regular mention, however, of the reception by bishops of kings within their cities, although no details are given, indicates that the entertainment of king and court was an obligation regularly imposed upon the bishops.[206] They furnished food and drink for the court, and in case the city contained no royal palace, living quarters as well, and this for as long a period as the king chose to remain in the city.[207] And yet a study of the itineraries of the Saxon emperors reveals that they lived for the most part on their own, and except for particular reasons made use of episcopal towns only when these were on the road from royal manor to royal manor.[208]

[204] *Anon. Haser.*, c. 23, *MGH, SS* VII, 260: . . . Cum (Henry II) tam sibi quam aliis ludos exhibere vellet, mandavit huic episcopo nostro, suo vero propinquo, in parte consanguineo, ut plenum sibi in via Ratisponensi daret servitium, archiepiscopo cuilibet nonnihil formidandum. Cui cum regius legatus singulatim quae danda essent magnifice enumeraret, tandemque ad immensam vini mensuram ventum esset, Pessime! inquit, dominus tuus aperte insanit. Unde deberem sibi tantum servitium dare, qui nec memetipsum satis queo pascere? Ego quidem socius eius eram genere; sed ipse fecit rebus quasi pauperem parrochianum, et nunc regale poscit a me servitium? Unde sibi tot carradas vini? Ego quidem de vino nihil habeo nisi unam parvulam carradam, quam dedit mihi sodes meus diabolus Augustensis episcopus tantum ad sacrificium . . . per sanctum, inquit, Willibaldum, ne una quidem gutta huius vini intrabit in os domini tui. Tandem cum defervisset ira eius, pretiosos imperatori aliquot pannos misit, et legato dixit: Hoc voluit dominus tuus, hoc habeat; hoc est Eistetensium episcoporum potius quam plenum regibus dare servitium.

[205] B. Heusinger, *Servitium Regis in der deutschen Kaiserzeit*, 55.

[206] *Ibid.*, 57: In der Bewirtung des Königs eine allgemeine Pflicht der Reichsbischöfe zu sehen ist.

[207] *Ibid.*, 62: Die Dauer der Bewirtungspflicht gegenüber dem König ist anscheinend unbeschränkt.

[208] The Ottonians used their Liudolfinger inheritance in Saxony (Alstedt, Quedlinburg, Memleben, Wallhausen, Merseberg) and the

Moreover, it is only with Henry II that this *servitium* comes to play any significant part in the royal economy, and not until the Salian period that episcopal towns preponderate in the itineraries. This gradual change is to be associated with the disposition of the royal manors (*Tafelgüter*). By the close of the tenth century the direct management (*Eigenwirtschaft*) of the royal land by *villici* had been replaced by a system under which the *villicus* was more of a fiefholder or leaseholder than a royal official, so that this land had to some extent become alienated.[209] This threw the traveling court more and more on the bishops to support, to say nothing of the reorganization of royal manorial economy that it involved, which seems also to have been undertaken by Henry II.[210] The house lands of the Liudolfinger and Arnulfinger in particular, brought into the royal fisc by the Saxon line, which might well have sufficed to support the traveling court, were so generously deeded away to the church that under the Salian dynasty the bishops were left to bear most of the burden.

In like manner it is very difficult to substantiate for this period the existence of a regularized *servitium* other than

---

Carolingian inheritance (Frankfort, Ingelheim, Aachen, Nimwegen and Tribur). The routes connecting these manors were the northern Hellweg (Corvey, Paderborn, Dortmund) and the southern Werra (Fulda Frankfort). Worms is the only episcopal city visited by Henry I more than once. The episcopal cities visited by Otto I three times or more are: Chur (3), Augsburg (3), Merseburg (4), Worms (5), Regensburg (5), Mainz (6), Cologne (7), Magdeburg (22). Otto II visited only one episcopal seat, Magdeburg (8). For Otto III: Mainz (6), Merseburg (6), Cologne (3), Magdeburg (3). *Ibid.*, 66 ff. *et passim;* tables of itineraries on p. 158.

[209] Heusinger (114, n. 3) lists the following grants out of *Tafelgüter* by Saxon kings: Henry I (3), Otto I (3), Otto II (5), Otto III (15), Henry II (3).

[210] Four episcopal cities head Henry II's itineraries: Merseburg (25), Magdeburg (17), Bamberg (14), Mainz (13), Other episcopal seats visited more than four times: Regensburg (11), Paderborn (9), Cologne (8), Augsburg (5), Halberstadt (5), Strassburg (5), Utrecht (4), Worms (4), Würzburg (4). *Ibid.*, 158 *et passim;* Thompson (*Feudal Germany*, 343, n. 1, 345) also points to this change.

this expected supply of food, drink and shelter for the royal court in the episcopal city. Here again one must be careful not to assume for this transition period the full exercise of rights developed and exercised subsequently, at a time when the fisc, the livelihood of the crown, was rapidly disappearing and the use of the church and church property became more and more necessary. It seems impossible, for example, to assume the exploitation by the Saxons of such rights as the *Spolienrecht*, the right to the personal property left by the bishop accumulated out of church income,[211] or the *Regalienrecht*, the right to collect all the revenue of a bishopric during a vacancy, or the *Regaliensperre*, the right to withdraw from a disloyal bishop or abbot the enjoyment of income from the exercise of his sovereign rights. That all income in an episcopal city from fines, market, mint and tolls fell into the royal treasury for a fixed period before and after the residence of the court in that city it is likewise difficult to demonstrate from any example.

Yet certainly more was expected from the bishop than a miscellaneous contribution to a moving court.[212] Although

---

[211] R. Eisenberg, *Das Spolienrecht am Nachlass der Geistlichen in seiner geschichtlichen Entwickelung in Deutschland bis Friedrich II.*

[212] In Otto III's exemption of the bishops of Passau from ducal servitia (*vide supra*, p. 59) exception is made, *MGH*, *DD* II, 527, No. 115: excepto quod regio honori . . . impendere debent; Heusinger, 64, n. 3. Otto I absolves the bishops of Schleswig, Ripen and Aarhus, *MGH*, *DD* I, 411, No. 294: ab omni censu vel servitio nostri iuris absolvimus et ut episcopis prescriptarum ecclesiarum absque ulla comitis vel alicuius fisci nostri exactoris infestatione serviant et succumbant, volumus et firmiter iubemus; Dümmler, 389, n. 2. In the *Hofrecht* of Burchard of Worms there is provision for a payment of six *denarii ad expeditionem* and four *denarii ad regale servitium* (Heusinger, 60). After Udalrich's nephew Adalbero, had demonstrated at court his capacity to serve the emperor, Udalrich was permitted to use him (*Vita Oudalrici*, c. 3, *MGH*, *SS* IV, 389): ut . . . in eius vice itinera hostilia cum milicia episcopali in voluntatem imperatoris perageret et in curte imperatoris eius vice assiduitate servitii moraretur. After the rebellious Henry of Augsburg decided to turn to the crown to solve his troubles, his method of incurring favor is described thus, *ibid.*, c. 28, 418: Ideo igitur saepius cum imperialibus muneribus eum visitavit et

we can hardly assume in the constant flux that embodies the constitutional development of the tenth century any systematization of the contributions of the episcopate to the material maintenance of the crown and its functioning as an instrument of government, yet as a matter of fact the alignment of class interests and personal ambitions, the interests of king and episcopate, together combined to strengthen the alliance of king and bishop that had long existed. The bishop is predominant in the conduct of public affairs. He journeys at his own expense to swell the attendance at court when the court is near, and he is present at all times to counsel the king. The royal chapel and the chancellery are conducted by him. He conducts or at least participates in all diplomatic intercourse within or beyond the limits of the empire. He furnishes his troops to the armies of the state, is often with them and sometimes leads them. He is ubiquitous; no government could have got along without him. But he is present and active with a purpose. It is this purpose rather than any constiutional compulsion that supplies the most adequate motivation for his significant role. The royal reward for his services, which came as a recognition of necessity on the part of a monarch none too securely established, had to be something even more than the opportunity for him to play so great and influential a part in the events of his day. The king had to recognize the bishop's ambition to strengthen and enlarge his own position as a feudal lord, and the whole tribe of tenth century bishops rejoiced in that what they once got hold of they never lost.[213]

---

drudes suos donis congruis sibi complacare satagebat et insuper hostilia itinera cum eo pergebat, taliter sicuti ei optime aestimabat placere. Again in this informing *Vita*, (c. 28, 416), we are told of two of Udalrich's nephews, Manegold and Hupald: quia . . . ab eo missi saepe in auxilio imperatoris cum herili multitudine militum venerunt, et in eius servitio, voluntatem eius strenue in omnibus adimplentes, tamdiu permanserunt, usque cum illius gratis muneribus honorati redire dimissi sunt. *Vita Godehardi prior*, c. 35, *MGH, SS* XI, 193: Cum episcopis qui tum forte herilis servitii gratia curti aderant.

[213] In addition for *servitia*, cf. Sommerlad, II, 245-249; Nitzsch, I, 357-378; Sugenheim, 348-354, 372; Meister, 94-102, 134; Ficker, *op. cit.*, 399-404.

G.

CONCLUSION

We are now in a position to attempt to formulate the policy of the Saxon dynasty towards the German church. The tenth and early eleventh centuries were a period of transition from the Carolingian *Beamtenstaat* to the *Feudalstaat* proper. The resistance to the development of a strong centralized monarchy manifested itself in the hereditability of state offices, built upon the secure foundation of ownership of land, and in perennial revolts of the dukes, supported by certain bishops, in opposition to an hereditary monarchy. As part of the means to counteract this threat it is generally taken that Otto I resumed the statesmanlike policy of favoring the church, especially the bishops, with grants of land from the royal fisc and with various special privileges, and of drawing the bishops into the service of the state with a view to checking the advance of the dukes and the lesser feudality. He hoped thus to creater a counter weight (*Gegengewicht*) in the state, which, being non-hereditary and amenable to royal control through appointment to office, would lend firmer support to the dynasty. This policy has been variously explained as in whole or in part the result of the revolts of the duchies, which led Otto to perceive the impossibility of relying for support upon the nobility, or as the result of the cooperation of a disaffected clergy with these revolts, which led him to appreciate the value of a loyal clergy, or as the result of his experience on his first Italian campaign, which taught him the advantages of a loyal episcopate, or as the result of his realization that it was dangerous to count upon the loyalty of dukes and bishops merely because they were his kinsmen. His appointment of his younger brother Bruno as archbishop of Cologne is generally regarded as the first full acknowledgment of this policy. The subordination in state government and the subjection to ducal authority which the bishops experienced under Henry I would then account for their ready acceptance of this new policy of Otto, which amounted to an

offer of alliance with the crown. In addition, the embarrassment of the bishops in the face of constant attacks from the nobility on their position and their property would supply a further essential element in the alliance between crown and upper clergy. The general picture, then, of the period from Otto I onward shows us a church, especially an episcopate, warmly and intimately allied with the crown in the face of a common threat. The success of Otto I with the policy led his successors to continue and expand it steadily, until under Henry II it reached a fuller fruition than under any of the Ottos.

The turning over of royal land to the bishops, it is argued, was wise, in that its direct administration was too difficult, with the court constantly on the move. Since lands administered for the crown by seculars came more and more to be regarded as property owned by hereditary officials, turning over such lands to the church kept out of the hands of laymen property that would otherwise have come to them ultimately, either through their administration of it in royal behalf or because it would be necessary to grant it to them in pay for services to the crown. Such land turned over to the church, therefore, prevented the growth of large lay landed estates, which in the hands of dukes or lesser nobility might provide material support for disruptive tendencies of greater or lesser proportions. Moreover, such royal property turned over to the church was put in the hands of men far more capable of exploiting it economically than either crown or nobility. Such land was therefore made more productive and could be drawn on more heavily for services to the state. By making it understood that such grants implied the performance of governmental services by the clergy, the crown was thus obliged to depend less and less upon the nobility to keep the state going, and had instead an ecclesiastical officialdom whose personnel could be manipulated through control of the election of bishops.

The extension in area and scope of grants of immunity clipped the judicial power and lessened the income of the

counts and bound the ecclesiastical nobility more directly to the crown. Grants to clergy of jurisdiction over entire counties meant a drastic restriction of the position of the count at the very moment when his perquisites were about to become hereditary, and turned over this larger judicial authority and income to a non-hereditary clergy, the loyal servants of the crown. The mere fact that other grants of sovereign power, such as market, minting, toll and hunting rights, were made to the church precluded their falling into lay hands. The undeveloped organization of the state prevented their being exercised by the state, while their possession by the church gave it larger means with which to serve the state. In general, therefore, the whole feudal tendency was checked by diverting it into ecclesiastical channels; the formation of duchies, counties, and other feudal states was limited; at the same time the monarchy was immeasurably strengthened by its ability to make the church serve the state in return for royal generosity and favor.

As will be shown, this policy can be traced in Italy and Lorraine as well as in the rest of the German monarchy. Concrete evidence of its application in Germany can be found in the erection of the new bishopries along the Saxon frontier and in the support given to the Saxon bishops when they brought to the king their complaints of sufferings at the hands of the Saxon nobility. Further evidence is to be seen in the support given Burchard of Worms against the noble's castle within Worms, or in the campaign against Otto of Hammerstein after his attack on the property of Mainz, which involved also the flouting of an imperial decision supporting that of the church. No doubt the most striking evidence is the overwhelming preponderance of clergy over seculars in grants of land and privileges and the obvious preference for clergy as instruments of government. Yet it would be interesting to know in detail, from a study of the part played in the Ottonian documents by lay sponsors of bishops, to what extent this preference was actually supported by the very persons who were being discriminated against, and to what

extent it was the result of constant pressure from the episcopal advisers at court in the interests of their own class, which the government was in no position to resist. We are accustomed to see in the policy of a government the results of the influence and pressure of the strongest economic interests in the state. To what extent was this true of the Saxon kingdom?

This summary of the play of intertwined interests during this period is at least roughly adequate. Yet in view of the fact that with every appearance of resistance to the political *status quo*, whether from feudal revolt or contested succession to the throne, there appeared to support it a clerical party of considerable size and importance, and in view of the bishops' stubborn resistance to anything that they regarded as interference in ecclesiastical affairs, we must beware of accepting too lightly the view that the policy of the Saxon kings resulted in the creation of a strong bulwark to the throne in a loyal episcopate. This is not to be so foolish as to deny the existence and development of such an interesting political institution. But it is certainly important not to overlook the fact that there apparently were those of the upper clergy who were no less anxious about the danger of a strong German monarchy than the feudal nobles themselves, and who saw no more difficulty in the way of accommodation with a feudal than with a monarchical régime, who in fact regarded the former accommodation as preferable.

The bishops, it must never be forgotten, were as feudally ambitious, as particularistically minded, as the most independent-spirited noble. Their loyalty could be as fickle and as transient as that of any secular, if they felt their independence of action circumscribed, or their own interests, no matter what they were, violated by the king. Their aims were to a large extent identical with those of the feudal nobility, i.e., the accumulation of wealth and power to support as independent an existence as possible. How could it be otherwise? They were born of the same families, of the same noble blood, and indeed, as we have noted, made bishops

for that very reason. They represented the same family interests, and often enough were awarded their bishoprics as a specific means of placating family interests. The bishopric was therefore one means to the enhancement of family prestige and, in spite of royal control of the personnel, a direct contribution to the process of feudalization. Even within this period we have seen instances of the attempt to make the episcopate hereditary by transferring the bishop's seat to his nephew or by somehow keeping it within the family. The position of nobles as holders of ecclesiastical properties, or as advocates, or even as ecclesiastical counts, shows that there was easy access through a back door to a share in the church's wealth and power, even though the front door was closed by the king. Again we see the result of the power of the local family. This cooperation with the local nobility, to which the bishops were obliged to resign themselves because the king who had appointed them was by no means always able to prevent encroachments upon their property and privileges, only intensified their passion ultimately to secure genuine and complete independence. In supporting and strengthening a church with such ultimate aims and with such immediate relations with the local feudality, the Ottonians therefore, even when they chose to favor the non-hereditary ecclesiastical over the hereditary secular nobility, were none the less supporting a movement bound in the long run to prove subversive of the monarchy. It is difficult to believe that such capable monarchs as these Saxons were unaware that they were perforce contributing to a power that constituted a threat to the very thing they were attempting to build up, even though the threat were temporarily concealed under the outward success of their control over a church that was still no conscious part of an international ecclesiastical organization headed by Rome. It might be said, therefore, that Henry I chose to compromise with the secular feudality at the expense of the ecclesiastical nobility, while Otto I and his successors chose the opposite policy. Essentially they were compromising with the same thing, and in view of the

dual nature of the ecclesiastical nobility, with the further possible development of such a conflict in loyalties as was to come with the investiture struggle, it is difficult to see that Otto I's policy was the wiser. Was it absolutely impossible to build up the state by turning over to the secular nobility what was turned over to the church? At least such an alliance threatened no struggle between church and state. Or are we perhaps assuming a sharper division of class interests than did in fact exist in tenth century Germany? History was to show that for the monarch the way of the Capetians was the only way out of the dilemma. That way the Saxon kings could not or would not follow.

This union of church and state to pursue in common their mutual interests was no result of the deliberate adoption of any new policy. The state-controlled church, whose clergy were employed by the state in the performance of public functions, and whose wealth was drawn into the service of the state, was an institution already at least five hundred years old. Ottonian policy might therefore be called a revival in a more complete form and under new conditions of an ancient practice, manipulated to meet contemporary problems. No attempt at any kind of government had been possible for centuries without the employment of the intelligence, training and resources to be found in the church. Government was obliged to employ literate servants, and where were these literate servants to be found in large enough number except in the church? There was no more choice in the tenth century than in any earlier century. The church was then a much more attractive *carrière ouverte au talent* than it has perhaps ever been since, and it drew into its service at least a good share of the very best talent in tenth century Germany, trained it, and gave it practically uncircumscribed opportunity to exercise its capacity to the limit. No state, no monarch, no government, least of all in tenth century Germany, could do without tapping this splendid reservoir of energy and capacity. Nor must we forget that we are dealing with a religious age, nor explain exerything in

terms of interest, policy, and necessity. The aura of mediaeval piety surrounds the support given by the state to the clergy and ecclesiastical institutions.[214] Nor are we to suppose that there was no genuine desire to support a civilizing institution. But at the same time, to the degree that the episcopate was used in manifold ways as an instrument of the state, there was a price to pay to these German bishops, and they were in a position to demand it. An offering had to be made to their secular interests: land, rights, power, honor, influence, freedom. They gave very little that they did not wish to give to get what they got.

In conclusion, therefore, it seems safe to say that on the whole any statement that assumes an unquestionably loyal episcopate allied with the crown in any consciously directed policy against the dukes and the lesser feudality is an oversimplification. The alliance of church and state was, from the point of view of each, a necessary one, entered into willingly in the interest of each, and yet ultimately destructive to both.[215]

---

[214] E.g., two grants of Otto II, *MGH, DD* II, 789, No. 360: ut ecclesiastice . . . pacis obtineamus tranquillitatem et post temporalis huius imperii decursum ad eternam perveniamus hereditatem; *MGH, DD* II, 814, No. 384: ut . . . auro (cf. ch. IV, n. 45) vitam eternam acquiramus. Also a grant of Henry II, *MGH, DD* III, 23, No. 20: Si ecclesias dei ex aliquibus divino nutu nobis concessis rebus ditamus, non solum ad regni nostri feliciorem stabilioremque statum nobis prodesse sapimus, verum etiam ad eterna paradisi gaudia capienda multum nos inde iuvari minime dubitamus. Cf. also second paragraph of n. 215.

[215] I have culled from my reading in the Ottonian documents the following statements, which would seem to be the closest direct expression of Ottonian policy. Cf. Otto I: *MGH, DD* I, 412, No. 296: Quoniam . . . sanctarum ampflicatio aecclesiarum salus regum vel imperatorum et prosperitas creditur esse regnorum; *ibid.*, 424, No. 310. Quoniam exaltatio aecclesiarum salus regum vel imperatorum et stabilitas creditur esse regnorum. Cf. Seeliger, 10. *MGH, DD* I, 431, No. 322, the king receives from the archbishop of Trier the abbey of St. Servatius in Maastricht (*loc. cit.*, 436: quoniam in eisdem partibus pro disponendis regni negotiis pluribus indigemus) and gives him in return the monastery of Oeren at Trier (*ibid.*: ne . . . aecclesia vel . . . archiepiscopus aliquid inde dampni patiatur). Such exchanges were fre-

CHAPTER III

BISHOPS IN LORRAINE

As compared with the political situation to which the German bishops had to adapt themselves, that in Lorraine was further complicated by the fact that this old Carolingian homeland did not sever itself easily from the Carolingian dynasty. As long as there sat upon the French throne a Carolingian there was always a possibility that Carolingian claims upon Lorraine would be pressed forcibly. The bishops east of the Rhine might have to compromise between their feudal ambitions and their loyalty to the Saxon dynasty, but in Lorraine, especially along the actual frontier between Germany and France, in addition to a feudal struggle similar in all its manifestations to that which we have discussed, there was also the question of a choice between Carolingian and Saxon. The problem of the Saxon dynasty here was

---

quent: *ibid.*, pro commoditate vel dispositione locorum aut temporum . . . de rebus aecclesiasticis concambia sepe solent fieri, ut . . . maior mutuantibus utilitas accrescat. Cf. Dümmler, 405, n. 3; Ficker, 402.

In *MGH, DD* II, No. 163, Otto II gives to the bishop of Seben-Brixen the confiscated ancestral estate of a certain Ascuin (*loc. cit.*, 183: curtem quae legum iudicumque diffinicione ab Ascuino infidelissimo ablata est), title to pass upon the death of said Ascuin's widowed mother Kunigund (*ibid.*: post vitam predictae Chunigundae). Such deeds to the church of property confiscated from rebels were likewise not infrequent: *ibid.*: Credimus deo esse acceptum nostraeque saluti impresenti et in futuro magnum esse subsidium, si venerabilium loca sanctorum dei pio affectu impiorum deo nobisque adversantium prediis decreverimus ditari; cumque ab ipsis imperialis maiestas non potest assequi temporalem tranquillitatem, non dubitamus meritis ac precibus sanctorum sempiternam nos posse consequi felicitatem.

Of Henry II: *MGH, DD* III, 475, No. 371: In huius vite itinere onera nostra episcopis imponendo levigantes (cf. Hauck, III, 409, n. 4); *ibid.*, 652, No. 509: Oportet ut in ecclesiis multe sint facultates et maxime in Fuldensi, quia 'cui plus committitur, plus ab eo exigitur'; multa enim debet dare servicia et Romae et regali curie, propter quod scriptum est: 'reddite que sunt cesaris cesari, et que sunt dei deo' (cf. Ficker, 400; Hauck, III, 409, n. 4). Cf. also the third document cited in n. 214.

quite as much imperial as feudal, i.e., the Germanization of the whole borderland of Lorraine. It is interesting to note the part played by the episcopate not only in the local feudal struggles but also in this effort of the Ottonians to create a loyal Lorraine free from the Carolingian threat.

Viking incursions and the break-up and partition of the empire of Charles the Great made of the Meuse and Moselle regions a hotbed of warring nobles, who long held a reputation for turbulence.[1] This nobiilty at first paid little attention to partitions or reunions. The division of Lorraine by the theaty of Meissen ceased to exist when the whole region was brought under the power of Ludwig the Younger or the Saxon. The nobility, however, supported the efforts of Hugh, the bastard son of Lothar II, to secure his father's throne. They even employed the Vikings to achieve their ends, a method that aroused such prelates as Bertolf of Trier and Wala of Metz to heroic if futile resistance. After the deposition of Charles the Fat Lorraine fell to Arnulf of Carinthia, who, although he was accepted by the nobility, in the face of their localism turned over the whole region in 895 to his natural son Zwentibold as an indepedent kingdom. Zwentibold was in no position to withstand the hostility of the remnants of the group that had supported Hugh, under the leadership of Regnier au Long-Col, of Carolingian descent and lay abbot of a number of monasteries. It was he who first appreciated the value of alliance with the French kingdom. Zwentibold, although probably supported by the bishops, could not withstand this combination, and died in a battle to recover his throne on August 13, 900. With him went the reformed kingdom of Lothar II, a kingdom that was not to reappear until the experiments of the dukes of Burgundy with a Middle Kingdom. The nobility of Lorraine, having got rid of Zwentibold had recognized the sovereignty of Louis the Child, the apparent price of the recognition being that Regnier

[1] Widukind, I, 30 (Kehr, 37): Gens varia erat et artibus assueta, bellis prompta mobilisque ad rerum novitates.

should be left in relatively undisturbed enjoyment of his pre-eminence between the Meuse and the Scheldt. Upon the death in 911 of the young Louis, the last German Carolingian, Regnier and his following recognized the Carolingian claim to Lorraine by refusing to acknowledge Conrad of Franconia as their king and by swearing allegiance to Charles the Simple. Conrad by no means gave up the German claim, as his attempts upon Lorraine indicate, and always, under French as under German sovereignty, Lorraine continued to have its own chancellor in the archbishop of Trier.

The memory of an independent kingdom and the preservation of this degree of autonomy was enough to nourish the desire to be free even from French sovereignty. At least this is the position that Giselbert, Regnier's son, who succeeded to his father's position upon his death in 915, seems to have taken. We have here a movement parallel to that of the duchies to the east of the Rhine. Regnier may be considered as the founder of the movement, and what his son inherited was really the position of duke, which he tried to strengthen by turning from party to party. The number of parties available was increased by the fact that Charles the Simple was losing the support of the French nobles under the lead of the counts of Paris, the future Capetians. When threatened by Charles Giselbert turned to Henry I; when disappointed by Henry I he turned to Robert of Paris, who was elected king in 922. After the election of Rudolf of Burgundy in 923 following Robert's death, when Giselbert was threatened with the loss of the support of part of his own following in Lorraine, he turned back again to Henry, since Charles the Simple was now a prisoner in the hands of Herbert of Vermandois. Along with the archbishop of Trier, he invited the German king to intervene in 923. This was the first decisive step in the reunion of Lorraine with the German crown, for by taking Metz from its defender, bishop Wigerich, who was a partisan of Charles the Simple, Henry I was able to add at least the eastern bishoprics of Lorraine to Germany.

The second and final step came in 925. In the meantime, in the face of internal opposition to himself as well as to the intruding Germans, Giselbert had turned to Rudolf of Burgundy, the king of France. After being originally rebuffed, he reached an agreement with Rudolf that brought Henry across the Rhine to subdue the rest of Lorraine, the western bishoprics, and make the Scheldt the boundary. A special envoy, Eberhard, was sent by Henry to arrange a final reconciliation with the nobility of Lorraine, whereby Giselbert was permitted to retain his position and title as duke. Moreover, by giving him his daughter Gerberga in marriage, Henry initiated the practice of marrying ladies of the royal family to anyone that had anything of great importance to do with Lorraine. He therefore adopted in Lorraine the same policy that he followed in his dealings with German duchies.[2]

In Lorraine, however, unlike Germany, the ecclesiastical arrangements of Henry I laid down a line of procedure that was to be carefully followed by his successors. Hugo, the hostile bishop of Verdun, was supplanted by Bernain, a nephew of Hugo's predecessor. Upon the death of Wigerich of Metz, who had resisted Henry in 923, Benno, a cleric of Strassburg, was installed, who was, however, so thoroughly detested within a short while that he was blinded and driven from the city.[3] The local house of Bar was then rewarded with the see in the person of Adalbero, brother of Frederick of Bar. The French sympathizer, Ruotger of Trier, was succeeded by Robert, a brother of Queen Mathilde, and Trier was permitted to keep the chancellorship for Lorraine. Gauzlin of Toul was completely won over and was rewarded

[2] R. Parisot, *Histoire de Lorraine*, I, 106-116, 184-187; H. Pirenne, *Histoire Belgique*, I, 36-45; Hartz, 1-17; Aubin-Levison, *Geschichte des Rheinlandes von der ältesten Zeit bis zur Gegenwart*, 72-73; Waitz, *JB H I*, 46-49, 69-73, 80-83 *et passim;* Richter-Kohl, 6, 10, 14.

[3] *Cont. Reg.*, 927 (Kurze, 158): Benno . . . a Metensibus excecatur et sinodo apud Duisburgum habita omnes illius facti auctores excommunicantur.

with a grant of the income of the count within the city.[4] Henry's action against Boso, the brother of Rudolph of France, exemplified another phase of Ottonian policy[5] at a time when here, as elsewhere, the church felt the need of protection.[6] Thus by the time of Otto I's accession German policy in this region was clearly laid down: recognition of the desire of the nobility for independence in the form of the dukedom, preferably connected by marriage with the German house; at the same time an effort to attach Lorraine more securely to the monarchy by a pro-German episcopate, enriched by the crown and supported against the nobility. For the remaining years of Henry I's reign Lorraine was safe for German overlordship.

The situation was still further clarified in 936 by the accessions of Otto I and Louis d'Outremer. In returning to the Carolingian house the French nobility brought to the throne a nephew of Otto I, for Otto's first wife, Edith, and Louis's mother, Edgwa, were sisters. This family relationship, however, did not keep Louis from clinging stubbornly to plans for the conquest of Lorraine, steadily pursued whenever possible by the Carolingians until their final loss of the throne in 987. But they were in no position to carry out this conquest with any degree of thoroughness, for their position at home was being steadily undermined by the Robertians, the house of the counts of Paris. The head of this house, Hugh of Francia, was still more closely conected with the Ottonians by his marriage with Otto's sister, Hedwig. Thus Otto I had to choose between supporting the Carolingians by holding his brother-in-law, Hugo, in check, and hastening their

---

[4] *MGH, DD* I, 52, No. 16: Omnem exactionem comitatus eiusdem civitatis. Cf. Poschl, 14, n. 8.

[5] *Flod. Ann.*, 928, *MGH, SS* III, 378: Boso ad legem venire nolebat de quibusdam abbatiis et terra episcopatuum quam . . . ceperat et pertinaciter Heinrici praecepta spernens detinebat. Richter-Kohl. 14.

[6] Tyrannorum principum successione tempore Gisalberti ducis seu Conradi ab invasoribus episcopium (Trier) omne direptum est, ecclesiae destructae, possessiones subrepte, dei cultus imminutus (quoted by Dümmler, 228, n. 3).

fall by abandoning his nephew to the mercy of a rebellious nobility. It was principally Lorraine that determined Otto's choice. If the Ottonians prolonged the life of the Carolingian house in France by making it virtually dependent upon the German king, it was at the price of its giving up all hope of success in pressing its claim to Lorraine.

The revolts of 938-940 and 953-954 in Germany had each its counterpart in Lorraine. At the outset of the former, bishop Bernhard of Halberstadt was sent as an envoy to Giselbert, and Otto exacted hostages from all suspected bishops. But Giselbert, moved presumably by a desire to achieve a position of local independence, joined Henry, Otto I's brother, and Eberhard of Franconia in 939 and even drew Louis d'Outremer into the struggle. The loyalty of Bernain of Verdun, Adalbero of Metz and Gauzlin of Toul weakened before the promises of the Carolingian monarch. By making an alliance with the Paris house against Louis, by setting up Count Immo in Lorraine against Giselbert, and finally as a result of the death of Giselbert at Andernach, Otto was able to crush this Lorraine-French part of the revolt, at the time when the whole movement collapsed. It was a bishop that resisted to the very last, Adalbero of Metz. Although Louis d'Outremer, already Otto I's nephew, hoped to strengthen his claim to Lorraine when he married Otto's sister Gerberga, Giselbert's widow, he succeeded only in strenghtening his hold upon his own throne. From him there was in fact no further threat to German dominion in Lorraine, whereas Gerberga, who tried at first to support her husband's claim, found herself henceforth constrained to act rather in cooperation with than in opposition to the Germans.

Otto I continued the systematic replacement of local nobles by outsiders, preferably kinsmen, in positions of importance in Lorraine. His father's appointee, Bernain of Verdun, a member of an important local family, by his recent reversal of allegiance had shown the importance of having here in this frontier see, amidst this non-German population, an un-

questionably loyal supporter. He was accordingly succeeded in 940 by Berengar, a Saxon noble and a relative of Otto.[7] It appears also that the king attempted to give Lorraine to his rebellious brother Henry in 940. Since in view of local hostility Henry could not be maintained, Lorraine was then turned over to a frontier count, Otto of Verdun, a bitter enemy of his half-brother, the recalcitrant bishop Adalbero of Metz. Upon the former's death, however, another outsider was brought in, the Franconian Conrad the Red. Under him bishops were accused of disloyalty,[8] but a few years after his accession an episcopal army was to be found supporting him and Otto I in behalf of Louis d'Outremer against Hugh of Francia, who was endeavoring to get reinstated in the archbishopric of Rheims his protégé, Hugo, who had been turned out to make room for Artaud, the candidate of Louis d'Outremer.[9] Conrad seemed a good man to have as a son-in-law;[10] Otto I gave him his daughter Liutgarde. He held Lorraine for Germany with a strong hand, and acted as Otto's special emissary in carrying out the policy of preserving the Carolingian throne. His chief opposition in Lorraine came from the family of Giselbert, led now by Regnier III, Giselbert's nephew, who had no use for this foreigner. When, after what appears to have been a personal difference between

---

[7] *Gesta epp. Virdun., Cont.*, c. 2, *MGH, SS* IV, 45: Berengarius primi Ottonis . . . consanguineus, vir nobilis et Saxonicus. Dümmler, 108.

[8] *Cont. Reg.*, 944 (Kurze, 162): Rex . . . placitum cum primoribus Lothariensium et Francorum habuit, ubi factione Cuonradi ducis Ruotbertus archiepiscopus Trevirensis et Richarius Tungrensis episcopus infidelitatis apud regem arguuntur.

[9] *Flod. Ann.*, 948, *MGH, SS* III, 397: Exercitu denique collecto, Lotharienses episcopi Mosomum (Mouzon) petunt, ipsumque obsidentes castrum atque oppugnantes milites qui erant ibi cum Hugone (archbishop of Rheims) ad deditionem compellunt; et acceptis ab eis obsidibus pergunt obviam Ludowico regi et Chonrado duco in partes Laudunensis (Laon) pagi. Richter-Kohl, 54. Rheims was a mainstay of the Carolingian house; to lose it would be fatal. Laon was their stronghold. Therefore Laon must be returned to Louis IV d'Outremer.

[10] Widukind, III, 44 (Kehr, 105): Bellator intolerabilis.

Conrad and Otto over his Italian services, he joined the rebellion of 953-954, he was not supported in Lorraine. His methods may have cost him personal unpopularity; at any rate, Otto was able to rely wholly on support from Lorraine in this crisis. His grants to the bishops of Utrecht, Cambrai, Liège and Trier no doubt helped to assure their support. At any rate, after depriving Conrad of his duchy, and at a time when the revolt east of the Rhine was taking on alarming proportions, Otto decided upon the bold step of turning over Lorraine to his brother Bruno, the new archbishop of Cologne. This single act exemplifies perfectly many tendencies in church and state:[11] the brother of the king, an archchancellor of the state, the archbishop of Cologne, became at the same time the duke of Lorraine.[12]

---

[11] Hartz, 17-47; Pirenne, 44-51; Parisot, 184-188; Dümmler, 62, 152, 158-159, *et passim;* Uhlirz, 41-42; Richter-Kohl, 43-44, 46, 48-49, *et passim.*

[12] Pöschl, 16, n. 13: Nicht nachweisbar ist jedoch die in der ganzen älteren Literatur hartnäckig behauptete Verleihung eines Herzogtums an Erzbischof Bruno . . . durch seinen Bruder, Otto den Grossen. I find no difficulty in persisting in this stubbornness. Ruotger, c. 20 (Pertz, 20), in first speaking of Bruno's new position says of Otto: fratrem suum Brunonem occidenti tutorem et provisorem et ut ita dicam archiducem in tam periculoso tempore misit. Later we find, c. 32, 40: in Lothariorum . . . populo, quem ipse ex integro susceperat gubernandum. To be sure, Ruotger does not state—no known document states—that Otto granted to his brother Bruno the *duchy* of Lorraine, over which he was to be *duke*. But just how unwarranted is such an assumption? What reason can there be to deny that Otto granted the duchy of Lorraine to Bruno as a duke, except that Bruno is not called a duke in the *diplomata*? And is he not called a duke or the governor of a duchy by a number of otherwise trustworthy sources? *Cont. Reg.*, 953 (Kurze, 167): Brun frater regis succedens totius Lothariensis regni ducatum et regimen cum episcopatu suscepit. *Ibid.*, 954 (Kurze, 168): Cuonradus dux cum Lothariensibus duce Brun archiepiscopo. *Ibid.*, 965 (Kurze, 176): Brun . . . vir ducatu pariter et episcopatu dignissimus. Widukind, I, 31 (Kehr, 38): Brunonem, quem pontificis summi ac ducis magni vidimus officium gerentem. Anselmi, *Gesta Epp. Loed.*, c. 24, *MGH, SS* VII, 201: Brunone archiepiscopo, eodemque ut aiunt duce. Thietmar, II, 23, (Kurze, 32): qualiter . . . domno

In the rather moving farewell speech which Ruotger puts into Otto's mouth as he was leaving Lorraine to his brother in order himself to hasten to Bavaria, the king tells him that it is his greatest consolation to see the authority of a priest and a king combined in his person and joined to his own imperial power.[13] Bruno himself felt that he was "begotten for the state," [14] and it would indeed have been impossible to find any man more fitted to shoulder the enormous burdens that fell to him. He was born in 925, the same year in which his father completed the subjugation of Lorraine. As a child of four years years he was sent to Lorraine to be educated in the school of bishop Balderich of Utrecht, and brought back to court only upon his brother's accession to the throne. The picture of this earnest lad is not unfamiliar: hungry for knowledge, rushing to his books after meals, guarding the early morning hours for study and jealous of hours that sleep deprived him of, caring little for the pomp of royalty, refusing to be hampered by the difficulties of acquiring an education at a court constantly on the move. Making use of all the scholars at court, he acquired a learning far above the average of his day, which on the one hand led to his being put on a plane with the ancients, and on the other to his being defended by Saint Paul before Christ and the saints against the charge of having delved too deeply into the inane study

---

Brunoni . . . episcopatum . . . ducatumque insuper regni daret Liutharii. *Flod. Ann.*, 953, *MGH, SS* III, 402: Cui etiam rex Otto regnum Lothariense committit. F. Lot, *Les derniers Carolingiens*, 31, n. 1, quotes *Ann. Nivern.*, 960: Bruno pontifex et dux venit cum magno exercitu in Burgundiam. At least, I have seen nobody deny that Bruno exercised the powers of a duke over Lorraine. Nor, if Bruno was not duke between 953 and 959, have we any idea who was. If we find a number of reliable sources referring to a woman as the wife of a certain man, may we believe this without seeing the marriage license?

[13] Ruotger, *Vita Brunonis*, c. 20 (Pertz, 20): Et hoc est quod in acerbis meis me maxime consolatur, cum video . . . nostro imperio regale sacerdotium accessisse. In te namque et sacerdotalis religio et regia pollet fortitudo.

[14] *Ibid.*, Praef., 3: Reique publicae procreatum.

of philosophy.[15] He became a leading influence in the stimulation of a genuine literary revival.[16]

At fifteen Bruno was drawn into the service of the chancellery, where, after 953 as an archchancellor, he continued to be very active until his death in 965. He had early taken orders and become abbot of several monasteries, notably that of Lorsch. After seventeen years' experience at court, where he had been inseparably connected with all the affairs of the kingdom, this young man of twenty-eight was summoned to the aid of his brother at a time of major crisis, summoned to an archiepiscopal seat coveted by the insurgents and to the unenviable political task of pacifying a new and notoriously refractory province. Surely this man was a concrete enough embodiment of the dual character of the episcopate. To say, however, that Bruno was archchancellor, archbishop, and, as Ruotger would have it, archduke also, is still to give an inadequate idea of the actual extent and variety of his activity. Whenever possible he was to be found at Otto's side, advising him about state matters.[17] He might be called the official mediator of the kingdom, east as well as west of the Rhine. To him together with his nephew, archbishop William

[15] *Vita Joh. Gorz.*, c. 116, *MGH, SS* IV, 370: ita . . . eruditus ut sui temporis omnes superaret et antiquos pene aequiperaret: Richter-Kohl, 71. Thiet., II, 16 (Kurze, 28): Christum cum sanctis omnibus sedentem. . . . Ibi Brun . . . ob inanem philosophiae executionem a summo iudice accusatur et a beato Paulo defensus.

We are not necessarily forced to believe that he read with a philological interest disdainful of contents the "scurrilous and farcical" tales of ancient drama which split the sides of others: Ruotger, *Vita Brunonis*, c. 8 (Pertz, 10): Scurrilia et mimica quae in comoediis et tragoediis a personis variis edita quidam concrepantes risu se infinito concutiunt, ipse semper serio lectitabat; materiam pro minimo, auctoritatem in verborum compositionibus pro maximo reputabat. Bruno, for all his intense sobriety, was a sane person not given to excess of any kind.

[16] *Vita Brunonis*, c. 5 (Pertz, 9): Oblitteratas diu septem liberales artes ipse retexit. *Ibid.*, Praef., 3: Cum in solis eius discipulis omne studiorum et eloquentiae genus . . . ita per multa terrarum loca floreat.

[17] *Ibid.*, c. 36, 37: De statu regni rebusque eius tutandis et dilatandis sedulo et strenue in commune consultum. *Ibid.*, c. 41, 42: Par semper invictum.

of Mainz, was left the guardianship of the young Otto II, as well as the administration of all Germany during Otto I's second Italian journey.[18]

The administration of Lorraine called for far more than the mere repression of the nobility. If possible a loyal province was to be created, and in so far as the bishops were to be an instrumentality thereto, to Bruno fell the task not only of training these prospective bishops in his company at Cologne but of seeing that his candidates got the bishoprics. Moreover, the administration of Lorraine called for success in dealing with the Carolingian house in France, which in fact involved its actual maintenance. Thus Bruno became unofficial regent for the Carolingian dynasty, and his authority extended as far as the Loire.[19] For such a man the administration in addition of the diocese of Metz during a vacancy of several years was a trifling matter.[20]

Bruno's first task was to gather around him the leaders of the royal party in Lorraine to consider means of action against the plans of Conrad, whose hostility at once shifted to him. Even before his consecration as archbishop of Cologne he called an assembly at Aachen, where at least four bishops of Lorraine appeared, Ruotbert of Trier, Balderich of Utrecht, Berengar of Verdun, and Fulbert of Cambrai. Here Bruno acted as preceptor and promised that even at the risk of his own life he would be ever ready to protect the peace of the church.[21] Bruno was, however, able to do nothing effective enough to prevent the invasion of Lorraine by

[18] *Vita Brunonis*, c. 36 (Pertz, 37): Hunc (Otto II) archiepiscopis patruo fratrique commendatum, ad custodiam regni Cisalpini reliquerat imperator. Dümmler, 375, n. 2.

[19] Lot, *Les derniers Carolingiens*, 19: Pendant neuf ans (956-965) Brunon fut presque autant régent de la France que duc, ou plutôt vice-roi, de la Lorraine; 51: Brunon avait dirigé la conduite de Lothaire pendant sa minorité, et par suite gouverné en quelque sorte la France septentrionale.

[20] *Dümmler*, 373.

[21] *Vita Brunonis*, c. 21 (Pertz, 22): eos variis multisque modis instruxit . . . spondens se ante tempus et in tempore semper paratum fore, ut pacem aecclesiae violatam, si sic necesse esset, vitae etiam suae periculo reformaret.

the Hungarians in the following year, 954, although he kept Conrad from Cologne. Conrad marched against him, but at Rümlingen Bruno, ever more willing to secure his ends by negotiation than by battle, secured an armistice.[22] This led ultimately to Conrad's coming to terms with Otto at Arnstadt, and the next year he lost his life fighting for the king at the Lechfeld. The only prominent noble of Lorraine that shared in Conrad's revolt was kept from doing great harm by Bruno's childhood master, Balderich, bishop of Utrecht, an anchor of dependability at this spot long after Bruno's death. In the crisis of the next year Bruno was unable to get troops to the Lechfeld in time and limited himself to taking steps to prevent a second incursion of the Hungarians into Lorraine. At this time also he arranged a final reconciliation at Bonn between his nephew Liudolf and the king, in the grand manner of a royal mediator.[23] It was Bruno, too, who finally brought together the king and Egbert, the long rebellious nephew of duke Herman of Saxony.[24]

By his contemporaries Bruno is reported to have been remarkably successful in his efforts to pacify Lorraine.[25] For the few years before his death, however, he seems to have been faced with a situation forcing on him even sterner methods, even though the German domination was never seriously threatened. In the early months of 956 we hear of his both exacting hostages from the Lorrainers at Ingelheim and accepting gifts from them at Cologne. It was in this year too that the separate archchancellorship for Lorraine held by the archbishop of Trier was abolished. The chief disturber of the peace, who was accused both of refusing to recognize the right of asylum of churches and of desecrat-

[22] *Cont. Reg.*, 954 (Kurze, 168).

[23] *Vita Brunonis*, c. 36, 36-37.

[24] Widukind, III, 59 (Kehr, 115).

[25] Widukind, II, 36 (Kehr, 82): Quem rex prefecisset genti indomitae Lothariorum, regionem a latronibus purgavit et in tantum disciplina legali instruxit, ut summa ratio summaque pax illis in partibus locum tenerent; *Vita Brunonis*, c. 39 (Pertz, 40): In Lothariorum . . . populo . . . quem etiam, sicut in praesentiarum cernitur, ex inculto et fero pacatum reddidit et mansuetum.

ing them with feasts, was the count of Hainault, Reginer III, Giselbert's nephew. In 957 in the Cambrésis he was overwhelmed by a coalition of Bruno and the Carolingians, and, when Bruno got hold of his person, was brought to Cologne and subsequently exiled to Bohemia. His property in Hainault was turned over to a supporter of the crown.[26] With this representative of the former ducal family Bruno certainly did not temporize. In the year 959 he took a still more drastic step. A former supporter, Immo, incensed, apparently, by an order to all nobles to destroy their fortifications and by an attempt to increase the revenue from Lorraine,[27] created such a serious disturbance that, in order to supervise more closely the opposition, Bruno decided to recognize the tendency of Lorraine to split into two parts by setting up two duchies, Upper and Lower Lorraine, corresponding roughly to the archdioceses of Trier and Cologne. Merely as an administrative step this might well seem wise; moreover, the two dukes could be played off one against the other. Yet perhaps it is also a confession of partial failure. Upper Lorraine was given to Count Frederick of the loyal Bar-Ardenne House, a brother-in-law of Hugh Capet.[28] Lower Lorraine seems to have gone to one of Bruno's pupils, Gottfried.[29] Over both Bruno maintained a sort of overlordship. As there is no record of an immediate successor for Gottfried, it has been assumed that upon his death Bruno reassumed the ducal position.[30] For all this, in the following year he was helpless before a new revolt of Immo; he could only come to

[26] *Flod. Ann.*, 957, *MGH, SS* III, 404: Bellorum tumultus agitantur inter Brunonem, ex praesule ducem, et Ragenarium comitem ceterosque Lotharienses; *Cont. Reg*, 958 (Kurze, 169): factione Brun . . . Reginerus comes comprehenditur et in Sclavos exul mittitur.

[27] Lot, 26 f.

[28] I know of no authority for Thompson's (*The Middle Ages*, I, 381) apparent belief that Bruno became duke of Lorraine only in 959, the year of the separation, and that he was duke only of Upper Lorraine.

[29] He is mentioned as duke first in 964.

[30] Or as Pirenne says, I, 59: Otton semble avoir voulu un instant faire de ce pays une sorte de marche ecclésiastique administrée per les évêques.

terms. The absence, however, of further information of this sort for the rest of his life, and the fact of his sending a strong Lorraine contingent to Otto in Italy, headed by Gottfried,[31] seems to show that his administration did have an ultimately quieting and beneficial effect.[32]

Bruno's influence upon episcopal changes in Lorraine between 953 and 965 was part and parcel of the whole Ottonian policy there. The German influence grew considerably,[33] and clashes began to occur between foreign bishops and the native populace. When in 956 through Bruno's efforts his kinsman Henry succeeded Ruotbert at Trier, all three Rhenish archbishoprics were in the hands of the royal family, and the bishops were often to be seen together in counsel and in battle.[34] At Liège Bruno tried to counter the influence of Regnier III, count of Hainault, and at the same time correct the scandals of a worldly clergy, by securing the episcopal seat for one of his teachers, the sharp-spoken Rather, who had already twice been driven out of Verona. The local nobility would not have this sixty year old reformer; a conspiracy drove him out and he was supplanted by Balderich, a candidate of the Hainault family.[35] Bruno, being at this moment

[31] *Vita Brunonis*, c. 41 (Pertz, 42): domino et fratri suo . . . auxiliares copias non levem armaturam de Lothariorum populo misit. His praefuit Godefridus dux quem ipse nutrivit.

[32] Ruotger's (*Vita Brunonis*, c. 37, 37-38) statement of Bruno's aim in Lorraine is this: Quaesivit . . . navos et industrios viros qui rem publicam suo quisque loco fide et viribus tuerentur. His ut neque consilium neque copiae deessent sedulo curavit.

[33] Pirenne, I, 56, states that from 953 on a large majority of the bishops *sont étrangers aux grandes familles du pays.*

[34] *Vita Brunonis*, c. 37, 38: hos (William and Henry) cum ipso (Bruno) simul non solum in lectione consilio et disputatione set etiam in acie vidimus.

[35] Anselmi, *Gesta epp. Leod.*, c. 23, *MGH, SS* VII, 201: nam dum in mores hominum tam scriptis quam dictis inveheretur aequo mordatius, hoc non ferente potentum insolentia, a nostra sede . . . deicitur. *Vita Brunonis*, c. 38, 40: conspiratio enim gravissima facta est . . . Baldricus qui erat de magnatorum terrae illius prosapia oriundus . . . sacramentorum fide . . . ut si accipere mererentur episcopum quem petebant, invicta exinde firmitate auctoritatem aecclesiae et ius imperatorium tuerentur.

unwilling to sacrifice the support of Regnier III, dropped his candidate, but obliged Balderich's supporters to take an oath of loyalty. After Balderich's death, however, when Regnier had been exiled and his property confiscated, a native Saxon, Everarchar, was put in at Liège under Bruno's influence.[36] At Cambrai—as we shall see in greater detail later—the policy of importing foreigners to fill bishoprics encountered even more determined opposition and had far more serious results. In 956 another Saxon and distant kinsman of the royal house, Berengar, succeeded Fulbert. Perhaps for reasons not known to us this was an unusually bold choice; to judge from what we do know, the choice seems to have been unwise, and it was certainly unfortunate. There was no common ground of sympathy between the bishop and the city, and Berengar had no thought but to crush by crude force the hostility that met him. When an attempt was made to keep him from the city upon his return from court, he avenged himself upon the citizens in an outburst of fury that respected neither human life nor the sanctity of churches, and then fled to Cologne.[37] Nothing daunted, Bruno had his candidate Ingrann installed as his successor, which goes to show how much in earnest he and Otto I were in this matter of bishops.[38] And indeed, Bruno's pupils filled the

[36] Anselmi, c. 24, *op. cit.*; annuente Brunone.

[37] *Gesta epp. Camerac.*, I, 80, *MGH, SS* VII, 431: Hic etiam tantae feritatis extitisse dicitur, ut non modo lingua et natione sed etiam moribus populo suo barbarus esse videretur. . . . Saepe itaque, partim propter eius animi immoderatam levitatem partimque propter civium repugnantium ferocitatem atque inobedientiam, inter se difficilis oriebatur seditio. It was only with the help of Bruno and Arnulf of Flanders that Berengar gained entrance into Cambrai at all after returning from a trip to Germany *propter obsequium caesaris.* For his punishment of Cambrai, cf. *ibid.*, I, c. 83, 432: civesque incautos subita incursione invasit . . . usque ad monasterium . . . persecutus est . . . armati limen sanctissimae aedis absque reverentiae modo irrumpentes, alios interfecerunt, alios truncatis manibus et pedibus demembrarunt; quibusdam vero oculos fodiebant, quibusdam frontes ferro ardente notabant . . . sicuti furiosus erat.

[38] *Ibid.*, I, c. 85, 432: Engrannus . . . obtentu Brunonis . . . archipatris . . . ad episcopale solium promovetur.

sees of Lorraine acceptably enough when they were not Saxon, or at any rate not too Saxon. The Bavarian Wicfrid succeeded the Saxon Berengar at Verdun, and the Cologne cleric Gerard succeeded Gauzlin at Toul. After his own temporary administration of the Metz diocese, Bruno secured it for his kinsman, the Saxon Dietrich. Later Count Ansfrid of Brabant, whom Bruno had trained in military affairs, became bishop of Utrecht.[39] Even outside of Lorraine proper, at Rheims Bruno's influence was paramount in the choice of a successor for Artaud in 961, for aside from its importance to the Carolingian house, Rheims was important also for Lorraine, since Cambrai was within its archdiocese. The cooperation of Bruno, Otto I, Pope John XII, Gerberga, and Lothar finally thwarted the ambitions of the Vermandois house to get Rheims for their own candidate, whereupon Bruno produced a suitable candidate from the Metz chapter, Odelrich, who was elected.[40] Thus at Trier, Liège, Cambrai, Verdun, Toul, Metz, and Rheims, Bruno either controlled or was strongly influential in determining episcopal successions. Nothing speaks so clearly for the significance of the bishops as loyal supporters of the crown, nor for the results of Bruno's influence and training on those associated with him.[41]

In addition to Bruno's political and military success and his influence upon the episcopate, a third factor in keeping Lorraine secure for the German party was his success in managing relations with France, whereby in return for his support of the Carolingians he got their promise to abandon claim to Lorraine. At times he was even able to count on them for military assistance. Being the uncle not only of the Carolingian brothers Lothar and Charles but also of the Robertian brothers Hugh and Otto, together with his sisters Gerberga and Hedwig he presided over a sort of family coun-

[39] Thiet., IV, 31 (Kurze, 82): strenuo domino Brunoni . . . traditur ad res militares.

[40] Lot, 38-40; Dümmler, 338-339.

[41] *Vita Brunonis*, Praef. (Pertz, 3-4): Quot quantosque de alumnis tanti viri episcopos . . . novimus, qui eum et familiarius noverunt!

cil. Their common aim was the maintenance of the *status quo* beyond Lorraine. Although unable to assist materially in the election of Lothar as king, yet both Bruno and Otto I could be definitely counted on to support Lothar's candidacy. When Gerberga's property in Hainault, her inheritance from Giselbert, was seized by Regnier, it was Bruno who settled the dispute amicably. When the Robertian and Carolingian nephews fell out over Burgundy in 958, Bruno went to Burgundy with a Lorraine army to keep the peace, and had to go to Compiègne early in the next year to continue his mediation. At the Easter celebration at Cologne in 959 Bruno made use of the support given Lothar against the Robertians in Burgundy to get from him assurances concerning Lorraine. In the fall of this year he returned to Burgundy at the head of a Lorraine-Saxon army to aid Lothar by laying siege to Troyes. Again in the next year he besieged Troyes in Lothar's behalf, but at the moment when Lothar was about to receive the submission of the Burgundian rebel, Robert of Troyes, Bruno arranged an agreement among his nephews, which looked to an honest partition of conflicting claims rather than a definite support of Lothar. Identification with the Carolingian interests even involved Bruno in a dispute between Thibaud of Chartres and Richard of Normandy. It was probably at the impressive Cologne gathering in the spring of 965 that his efforts were sealed with success by the betrothal of Lothar and Emma, daughter of Otto I's second wife Adelheid. In the fall of that year Bruno betook himself again to Compiègne to mediate in a new phase of the Burgundian dispute. It was on this trip that he fell ill and died at Rheims, complaining of no particular malady but simply of the collapse of his body.[42] He had worn himself out in the service of the state at the age of forty. Bruno had indeed shown himself to be the "ambidextrous" prelate.[43] Although not himself attracted to the

[42] *Vita Brunonis*, c. 43, 44: non morbum sed dissolutionem sui corporis.

[43] Lot, 22, n. 3.

life of politics, he had labored incessantly alongside of his brother in the state's interest.[44] Ruotger calls him "father of his country."[45] There was perhaps no more intelligent or versatile churchman during the Middle Ages in Germany.[46]

In Lorraine Bruno's mantle fell upon Notger of Liège. Notger did not occupy any such preeminent position as Bruno; moreover, the occasion for such extreme measures was past. Upper Lorraine remained in the hands of the loyal house of Bar, whose alliance by marriage with the Capetian house checked all Carolingian gestures towards Lorraine. This alliance finally helped to bring peace when the throne of France fell to the Capetians, who were, moreover, too fully occupied with internal difficulties to attempt any active policy of expansion. Lower Lorraine, to be sure, went to the Carolingian house in 977 when Charles, Lothar's brother, became duke, but his attention was directed more to securing the French throne than to establishing an independent position for himself in Lorraine. His son Otto as duke of Lower Lorraine remained loyal to the Saxon house until with his death in 1012 the male Carolingian line died out. It is accordingly rather as the counsellor of four German kings,[47] as a participant in affairs of state for over fifty years, as an educator of bishops in the schools of Liège, as the very versatile builder of a loyal German principality on the confines of the Empire,

---

[44] *Vita Brunonis*, c. 29, 29: Civilium negotiorum occupatione detentus est, ad quam eum non sua libido set populi necessitudo attraxit; c. 41, 42-43; gravissimus auctor ad constituendam, fidelissimus socius ad comparandam, fortissimus adiutor ad rem publicam perficiendam fuit.

[45] *Ibid.*, c. 46, 48: hunc patrem patriae; c. 23, 25: Honestum enim et utile nostrae rei publicae fuit omne quod fecit.

[46] For the general narrative of the period of Bruno, cf. *Pirenne*, I, 53-57; Lot, 9-53; Aubin-Levinson, 74-82; Hartz, 48-57; Gerdes, *Geschichte*, I, 655-673; Nitzsch, I, 341-343; Hauck, III, 40-45; and the *Jahrbücher* of Dümmler, Uhlirz, Richter-Kohl.

[47] *MGH, DD* II, 658, No. 240: in recompensatione videlicet servitii avo patrique meo et mihi (Otto III) exhibiti et devotionis quam in eo pre omnibus promptam ad exequendam voluntatem meam et iustitiam semper repperi. G. Kurth, *Notger de Liège*, 39, n. 6.

that Notger looms up beside Bruno in the ranks of the Lorraine clergy, a prelate *"tout impérialiste."* [48]

Before Notger's time Liège was a town of little consequence. But recently transplanted from Tongres and harassed by the Vikings, it had first attained some scholastic importance under the Saxon bishop Everarchar, after whom it continued to grow in influence with the prolongation of German control. Everarchar was a person of considerable political importance,[49] but it is for his stimulation of the schools that he stands out, as so many tenth century German prelates do.[50] He was the personal adviser of the students, anxious for their welfare whether he was at home or abroad on state business, and sending to the teachers from the depths of Calabria stimulating letters and poetry.[51] It was he too who, armed with at least enough knowledge of astronomy to know that an eclipse of the sun did not mean that the last judgment

---

[48] Pirenne, I, 20. Kurth, 4: Par lui, la monarchie trouva pour un siècle dans la principauté de Liège son plus solide boulevard en Lotharingie.

[49] *Aegid. Aur. Vall.*, c. 47, *MGH, SS* XXV, 54: Ottoni . . . ac Brunoni . . . ita carus . . . ut nulla rerum maiorum exercerent negocia nisi in illius praesentia, nisi eius essent consilio adstipulata.

[50] E.g., Wolfgang of Regensburg. *Vita S. Wolfgangi*, c. 18, *MGH, SS* IV, 534-535: Ut autem adolescentes in capiendis scientiae liberalis noticiis forent agiliores, frequenter voluit tabulas eorum cernere dictales. Plerosque etiam eorum proficiendi causa beneficiis incitavit, qui autem desides erant et negligentes increpavit. Kurth, 256, n. 1. Burchard of Worms heard daily recitations of his pupils and corrected and handed back written exercises: Boos, I, 263.

[51] Anselmi, *Gesta epp. Leod.*, c. 24, *MGH, SS* VII, 201: cum . . . aput illius temporis nostrates funditus liberale studium cum memoria absolvisset, ille scolas per claustra stabilire curavit; quas ipse vicissim non indignum duxit frequentare, lectiones maiusculis tradere, si quid minus in lectione intelligerent, benignissime identidem inculcare, spondens, quae non tam facile paterent intellectu, se eis vel cencies enodare. Si quando autem eum contingeret aut ad palatium aut in expeditionem longius ab hac urbe discedere, quos reliquisset scolarum magistros, litteris animare, ipsis crebro dulci carmine alludere solebat, adeo quibus praesens congaudere non poterat, uti erat imperialibus edictis obnoxius, sepe ab Italia, sepe a Calabria ut caros filios ad studia incendebat.

was at hand, had to go among the cowering soldiers of a German army in Calabria on December 22, 968, urging them to come forth from their hiding places, 'for it was shameful to be terrified by what were only natural phenomena.'[52] Building upon this substantial foundation, Notger made of the Liège schools one of the most important intellectual centers in the whole empire. In his zeal, we are told, not only the freeborn but serfs of the episcopal household were to be educated, some of whom he claimed for his school from their mothers before they were born.[53] Even absence on business did not interrupt his preoccupation with his students; they packed up their books and went along with him.[54] This was in itself a part of the necessary training for the cleric who was expected to be able to do almost anything.[55] Out of the Liège schools, at Liège itself and elsewhere within the diocese, especially at Lobbes, came a notable series of loyal bishops: Gunther of Salzburg, Heimo of Verdun, Hezelo of Toul, Burchard of Worms, Rothard and Erluin of Cambrai, Adalbold of Utrecht, Wolboldo, Durand and Wazo of Liège.[56] Notger

---

[52] Anselmi, *Gesta epp. Leod.*, c. 24, 202: singulos ipse circuiens . . . arguens . . . cur . . . ex hoc naturali solis defectu animis tam facile labefactari potuerint. . . . Pudeat naturales elementorum vices horrere. Dewez, *Histoire de Liège*, 22-23.

[53] *Ibid.*, c. 29, 205: Cum . . . tam diligenter et ingenuos et eos qui essent ex fideli familia aecclesiae, quorum non nullos sepe a praegnantibus etiam expostulasset matribus . . . alendos esse censeret. . . .

[54] *Ibid.*, c. 28, 205: Adeo ut quocumque vel ad proxima vel ad longinqua loca pergeret, scolares adolescentes, qui uni ex capellanis sub artissima non aliter quam in scolis parerent disciplina, secum duceret, cumque his librorum copiam ceteraque arma scolaria circumferri faceret.

[55] Bernward of Hildesheim as a student was taken along by Thangmar on business of his bishop, and together they spent whole days studying as they rode from place to place: *Vita Bernwardi*, c. 1, *MGH. SS* IV, 758: Quem (Bernward) etiam mecum interdum in servitium domni episcopi extra monasterium excedens ducebam. . . . Nam saepe totum diem inter equitatum studendo attrivimus, nunc legendo . . . , nunc poetizando.

[56] Anselmi, *op. cit.*, c. 29, 206; Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, I, 353-354; Pirenne, I, 144-145; Kurth, 261-297; Hirsch, I, *JB H II*, 406-407.

himself was anxious to secure suitable bishops for the two other frontier sees of this region, Cambrai and Utrecht. At the death of Tetdo of Cambrai in 979 he hurried to the court at Pöhlde in midwinter to push his own candidate and pupil, Rothard,who got the bishopric.[57] After Rothard's death, to counteract the efforts of those who, by bribing Sophia, the abbess of Gandersheim, Otto II's sister, were trying to get Cambrai for Azelin, the natural son of the Count of Flanders, he sent his own candidate and pupil Erluin, the archdeacon of Liège, to Otto III's aunt Mathilde, the abbess of Quedlinburg. In this contest between the royal ladies Mathilde won.[58] Bruno's former protégé, Count Ansfrid, became bishop of Utrecht with Notger's support, and his successor, Adalbold, was a Liège pupil. In the remark of Wazo of Liège that even if at the emperor's command he should lose his right eye he would never fail to use his left for the honor and service of the empire, we may see the spirit that reigned in the Liège schools.[59]

It was with the utmost regularity that Notger during his thirty-eight years as bishop was to be found at court and at church councils and therefore in touch with the major problems confronting the empire, especially those pertaining to Lorraine. His office itself was a reward for service in the chancellery under Otto I. Otto II calls him the "supporter and promoter of our (royal) will" and rewards him for "his well-known loyalty in all things at home and abroad."[60] In the struggle for the throne after Otto II's death, after leaning at first towards the support of Henry of Bavaria in preference to Lothar of France, he finally joined Gerbert in back-

---

[57] *Gesta epp. Comerac.*, I, c. 102, *MGH, SS* VII, 443: obtentu Nocheri . . . episcopi.

[58] *Ibid.*, c. 110, 448.

[59] Anselmi, *op. cit.*, c. 60, 225; cf. Pirenne, I, 60.

[60] *MGH, DD* II, 63, No. 53: Nostrae voluntatis fautor simul et adiutor; *Ibid.*, 365, No. 308: propter supradicti Notkeri episcopi in omnibus extra domique spectatam fidem et devotionem erga nostrae fidelitatis executionem. Kurth, 57, n. 2, 68, n. 2.

ing Theophano and Otto III, in consequence of which loyalty to the German side Liège had to suffer a French attack. At the court of Otto III he was during the regency among the leading counsellors, and finally one of Otto III's favorites.[61] Four times he journeyed over the Alps to Italy to further the imperial cause there, and he may well be the Notger who for years at a time at the end of Otto III's reign acted as royal *missus* under the hot Calabrian sun.[62] Under Henry II, too, he was present at the leading political and ecclesiastical gatherings. It was he to whom the king, in 1006, entrusted the negotiating of an alliance with Robert of France against Baldwin of Flanders. As in the case of old Willigis of Mainz, with whom he was often in close touch and sympathy, it is only after observing year after year after year his unspectacular appearance at the spots where events of most moment were happening that we can appreciate his prominence in his day.

In defending the independence of his city from the encroachments of the local nobility Notger may well have set an example for his old Liège pupils, among them Burchard of Worms, whose accomplishments in that line we have already had occasion to notice. Liège had already revolted against its Saxon bishop Everarchar, broken into his palace, and sent his Worms wine running in a red stream down to the Meuse. He had also lost several manors from depredations of his own soldiers.[63] Much earlier, in 933, bishop Richar had been

[61] Anselmi, *op. cit.*, c. 25, 203: Quippe qui . . . in palatio Ottonis tercii adhunc pueri, inter primos consiliarius esset; *ibid.*, c. 30, 206: ut . . . imperator vero in disponendis regni negotiis primum habuerit. Notger appears thirteen times in *diplomata* from 987 to 997, eight of which are for Lorraine. Kurth, 83 ff.

[62] Kurth, 99-101.

[63] Anselmi, *op. cit.*, c. 24, 202: Multa . . . episcopus a suis sepe perpessus . . . dum cives Leodicenses domum eius vi irrupissent, et rubeos Wormacensis vini rivos a monte . . . usque in Mosam deduxissent. . . . Et quamvis innumeris premeretur molestiis et multa familiaris rei angustia, quippe qui a viris militaribus episcopio appendiciis privatus esset villis.

obliged to destroy a castle of count Bernard.[64] Notger, therefore, had first to bring to terms those who had harassed his predecessors.[65] He realized full well that being bishop of Liège was not simply a matter of robes and dignity,[66] and the recalcitrant nobility found him not easily put upon.[67]

There were two special dangers to the peace of Liège that Notger had to combat. The one arose from a noble's request for permission to build a fort on an eminence within the town.[68] The other already existed in the strong castle of Chièvremont, which was too dangerously close to Liège when held by enemies.[69] In the first instance the bishop met the

---

[64] *Flod. Ann.*, 933, *MGH, SS* III, 381: Richarius episcopus . . . quoddam castellum Bernardi comitis . . . evertit, eo quod in suae ecclesiae terra situm esset.

[65] *Vita Notgeri*, c. 1: Globum enim obdurationis eorum qui adversus suum Leodiensem episcopum dominum Evraclium se conflaverant judiciaria virtute contrivit et eos penali disciplina usque ad dignam correctionem subjecit. The *Vita Notgeri*, which Kurth regards as an eleventh century biography incorporated in *Aegidius Aur. Vall.* (*MGH, SS* XXV, 57-63), he prints in Volume II, appendix II, pp. 10-15 of his *Notger de Liège.*

[66] *Vita Notgeri*, c. 1: Cognoscens ergo se vocatum non ad dignitatem tantum sed in opus ministerii sibi crediti, ad destruendum et eradicandum, ad plantandum et edificandum, mala civitati incombentia intus et extra destruxit et ne resurgerent evulsit.

[67] Anselmi, *op. cit.*, c. 30, 206: superbis divitibus terribilis . . . iniquis et factiosis hominibus metuendus. *Vita Notgeri*, c. 8:

> Nam (sumus experti) quicumque fuit violator
> Ecclesie . . .
> Ivit in exilium, resipiscere ni properasset.
> . . .
> Aut fregit collum vel amatos perdidit artus.
> Talis erat reprobis, tam formidabilis omni
> Perjuro, praedoni, furi; non perfidus ausus
> In faciem venisse suam.

[68] Anselmi, *op. cit.*, c. 26, 203: Erat in hujus urbis editissimo loco spacium quod talis videretur capax esse aedificii, unde reliqua urbs ab eiusdem arcis habitatoribus violenter posset impugnari.

[69] *Ibid.*, c. 25, 203: miseros Leodicenses liberare studuit a munitissimo et factiosis hominibus semper fecundo Montis Caprarum castello. Quod

request of the noble obligingly, seeking only a postponement of the beginning of building operations. Actually, in the meantime he took steps to make this new fort impossible by getting a building of his own started: the archdeacon was ordered to have the foundations of a church on the spot finished before the day upon which it had been agreed the noble might begin his own fort. This was done. Now Notger was, like all foreigners, a bad foreigner, for he was a Swabian, and the Swabians had a reputation for trickery.[70] And indeed, he was accused by the foiled noble of nothing less than Allemanian deceit, and called upon to explain. The bishop passed on the responsibility to the archdeacon, who, when summoned to the presence of Notger and the noble, after indignant questioning on Notger's part, explained simply that he had thought to enrich the blessings of the city by starting a church on what was only a vacant spot. Under these circumstances, Notger pointed out, it was impossible to destroy the foundations of a church in order to substitute for it an abode for armed men: the building of the church would have to continue. So, as the chronicler informs us, a noble's trickery was put to naught, not by any fraud on the part of the bishop but only by his attention to business.[71] Thus Notger saved future bishops of Liège from the predicament in which Burchard of Worms found himself.

But Notger was already in almost as bad a predicament himself because of the existence of the nearby castle of

---

quam damnose vicinum fuerit ipsi Leodio, haut longe hinc distantes fidelibus oculis subiectae attestari possunt eiusdem oppidi ruinae.

[70] Rupert, *Chron.*, c. 9, *MGH*, *SS* VIII, 265: de pessima gente Alemannorum qui semper infidi et instabiles mente fuerunt. Anselmi, *op. cit.*, c. 25, 203: Genere quidem Alemannus, sed admodum omni morum elegantia insignitus; *ibid.*, c. 26, 204: illum perfidiae accusat et fraudis Alemannicae. Kurth, 44, nn. 3-4.

[71] Anselmi, *op. cit.*, c. 26, 204: Assumpta ergo euangelici serpentis astucia, vultu . . . pro tempore simulavit, corde autem quomodo domestici hostis obviaret insidiis . . . deliberabat. . . . Ita profecto dolus eius (the noble's) . . . admodum non fraude sed industria pontificis compescitur.

Chièvremont. Later historians of Liège, in the effort to explain how a mere bishop could destroy so powerful a castle, resorted to another tale that turned upon his Allemanian deceit. He was supposed to have taken advantage of an invitation to christen the child of count Immo, who was at the moment in possesion of Chièvremont, by taking with him a sufficient number of soldiers to destroy the castle, marching in solemn procession with their military equipment nicely concealed under ecclesiastical robes. Once inside, the determined masqueraders doffed their holy costumes and proceeded to a wholesale destruction of the fort.[72] What seems actually to have happened, however, is that Notger used his influence at court to urge the destruction of a castle which not only was seriously harmful to him but harbored enemies of Otto III, and would be a great danger in the hands of French claimants to Lorraine. It was destroyed very probably after a long siege by an imperial army in 987. At any rate, after Notger's day only its ruins could be seen from Liège.[73]

Nowhere, perhaps, in the German state of the tenth century was the position of the bishop so difficult as in the border town of Cambrai. The town itself was French speaking, and the bishopric was in the archdiocese of Rheims. Within his own city the bishop's position was contested strongly over a very long period, first by a resident count and then by the bishop's own advocate. Either was in a favorable position to attract the refractory soldiers of the bishop. Furthermore, the bishopric was located between Hainault, whose counts never maintained any very consistent policy towards their German overlords, and Flanders, whose counts were certainly interested in expansion far enough beyond the Scheldt to include Cambrai, and in securing an ever more independent position between the German and the French kings. These were neighbors to whom both the bishop's advocate and his soldiers might turn. Finally, there was the

[72] Cf. e.g. *Aedigius Aur. Vall.*, c. 50, *MGH, SS* XXV, 57; Dewez, I, 23-26, repeats the story in dramatic fashion.

[73] Cf. Kurth, 184-194.

French king with his claims: Cambrai stood directly in his path on the easiest road into Lorraine. In such a situation, to have freed the city from all possible threats and attacks would have required a remarkable series of indomitable bishops. That Cambrai did not have. Yet, with the assistance of the crown, the bishops of Cambrai carried on an unrelenting struggle with these various forces of opposition, whereby they were at least able to hold their own. When we consider, too, how easy compromise would have been, their steady resistance and their steady support of German imperial interests at this strategic point exemplify richly those activities of the tenth century bishops that we are trying to portray.

The chief concern of the bishops of Cambrai, almost to the exclusion of everything else, in the first half of the tenth century was what the author of the *Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium* describes as a city with two pilots.[74] The bishop and the count clashed within the city. The first count to initiate the long struggle with the bishops was Isaac, who seems to have enjoyed a jurisdiction confined to the town of Cambrai itself. Here he held the small monastic house of St. Humbert and the important one of St. Gaugericus, with all the rights and privileges it enjoyed. In addition he held one half of the castle within the city, one half of all the public income, and one of the two mints. What all this came to seems to have been that the immunity district of the bishop within the town included the other half of the *castellum*, and that his half of the public income included fines assessed within the immunity and the toll and minting charges (which he probably got in 941). Isaac, restricted to income from fines and other possible charges outside of the immunity district, coveted the toll and minting income of the bishop, while the bishop coveted the income from which he was excluded by Isaac's position in the city.[75] At least the beginnings of

[74] *Gesta epp. Camerac.*, I, c. 71, *MGH, SS* VII, 426: urbs sub diversitate biremis dominii agebatur.

[75] W. Reinecke, *Geschichte der Stadt Cambrai bis zur Erteilung der Lex Godefridi* (1227), 17-19; A. Dieckmeyer, *Die Stadt Cambrai.*

the dispute between bishop Fulbert and Isaac had to do with conflict between their respective collecting agents.[76] The outcome was that Isaac, who intended to drive Fulbert out, was driven out himself, and started a little private war by forcing his way back in.[77] In this difficulty Fulbert turned to Otto I, who visited Cambrai on his return from Paris in 946. Otto settled the controversy by pronouncing judgment upon Isaac and depriving him of his countship. In addition, the abbey of St. Gaugericus and all rights pertaining thereto were turned over to the bishop. In this fashion the double dominion over the town was resolved into a single. For there is good reason to believe that from 946 on the bishop of Cambrai enjoyed the full rights of count within the city.[78] There is seldom indeed to be found so perfect an example of the direct substitution of episcopal for lay authority under the Ottonians.

Sole dominion within the city was, however, a thing to be acquired, not simply to be granted. With count Isaac gone, the unmanageable population of the city remained as difficult to subdue as ever, a fact that Fulbert's successor Berengar, as we have already noted, learned to his cost. There was also the contumacious military of the bishopric, whose attacks bishop Ansbert was not spared and which he had to call in outside help to subdue.[79] The next major difficulty, however,

---

Verfassungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen aus dem zehnten bis gegen Ende des zwölften Jahrhunderts, 8-10. Cf. Hirsch, I, 355-356.

[76] *Gesta epp. Camerac., loc. cit.*: Semper enim inter ministros eorum pro rebus exigendis audiebatur confragosa seditio.

[77] *Ibid.*: ut eum (the bishop) quadam die una cum suis sede relicta mandaret quantotius aufugere, solus videlicet postea totius urbis indiscrete negotia possessurus . . . comes reversus, collecta valida manu, . . . urbem repetiit, multasque inquietudines ingerens episcopum aliquandiu lacessivit. Denique etiam alternis conflictibus gravis inter se contentio adolevit.

[78] *Ibid.*, I, cc. 72-73, 426-427; Dieckmeyer, 11-13, Reinecke, 19 ff.

[79] *Ibid.*, I, c. 433: Hic autem, ut antecessores iam diximus et ut successores posterius dicturi sumus, graves atque multas iniurias ab ipsis suis militibus sustinuit.

came from the growth in power during a series of short episcopal reigns of the bishop's advocate, who, now that the bishop's position within the city was at least legally secure, was himself a personage of major importance. To his prerogatives as advocate, now that the bishop was legally the count, he joined those of the count's representative as well, i.e., the personage called in the German cities *Burggraf*, in this French area *châtelain*.[80] As the administrator of the episcopal property, of the episcopal militia, and of the *Blutbann*, the advocate-castellan in Cambrai quickly became the bishop's opponent in a series of bloody conflicts protracted over generations, which merely continued the old struggle between the bishop and the count. The advocate's purpose was to make himself as free as possible from the bishop whose chief servant he was supposed to be.

The first bishop to have to contend with the Cambrai advocate was Tetdo, another foreigner and in fact another Saxon, ignorant of the language and ways of his prospective flock, who to begin with hesitated to come to a city with such a reputation for turbulence as Cambrai had.[81] The first advocate to challenge the bishop was John, who during Tetdo's absence on imperial business[82] collected the material that he had assembled for the enlarging of the cathedral and used it to build for himself within the town's fortifications a house with a high tower.[83] Under these circumstances the bishop upon his return simply drove John out of the city.[84] John,

[80] Dieckmeyer, 14-18.

[81] *Gesta epp. Camerac.*, I, c. 92, *MGH, SS* VII, 438: Tetdonem . . . primis atque maioribus Saxoniae progenitum . . . licet renitentem, quia pravos mores et ferocitatem audierat Cameracensium; c. 99, 441: . . . episcopo, utpote simplici viro et linguae regionis ignaro.

[82] *Ibid.*, c. 93, 438: Sed inter agendum exigente rei necessitate ad imperatorem profectus est.

[83] *Ibid.*, 439: domum cum summo aedificio in eodem castro.

[84] *Ibid.*: ad ulciscendam tantae temeritatis audaciam . . . coacto copiosi exercitus auxilio, exterminavit eum ab urbis confinio.

however, had powerful relatives in Vermandois, who were quite willing to assist him in getting back his position, and Tetdo, in order to put a stop to the incessant attacks upon his property, was obliged to call upon outside help in the person of Walter of Lens.[85] For the bishopric this was an ominous step. In order to secure Walter's help at all, Tetdo had to promise that John's position within Cambrai should go to Walter's son. When once this had happened, however, Walter's interest in defending the bishop waned. He strove only to get the advocacy into his own hands, and put so little check on John's devastations that Tetdo had to buy the latter off with a restitution of his benefices, if not of his office.[86] Henceforth Walter was a terror to the Cambrai bishops. With his French support he was able from time to time to extort from them increases in his holdings, which made his position only the more formidable. He was able to use the ruse, for example, that Lothar of France was about to pounce upon Cambrai, to secure from Tetdo rich rewards for warding off this alleged attack.[87] This was a game played by others as well as Walter, for Cambrai was always in a way to be attacked by covetous neighbors.[88] In addition to perpetual attacks from his own vassals, this was indeed more than Tetdo could bear, and when Lothar did break into Flanders and Cambrai was threatened, in a mood of rueful despair at ever having come to live among these barbarians he quitted his see for Cologne, where he soon died.[89]

With Cambrai thus without a bishop it was necessary to take measures to protect the city from Lothar, to hold its

---

[85] *Ibid.*: Walterus quidem Lenensis castri vasallus, iuxta eminentiam secularis potentiae clarus, sed versutia et calliditate ingenii plenus.

[86] *Ibid.*: episcopus crebra infestatione coactus tantumdem paene beneficii ei restituit.

[87] *Ibid.*, c. 99, 442: Hac fraude episcopi gratiam captans, maximam opulentiam donorum excipiebat, immo vero cum aliis beneficiis villam cui nomen Lambras extorserat.

[88] *Ibid.*: One Heriward used the threat of an attack from Hainault to secure *advocatias aliquantarum villarum.*

[89] *Ibid.*, c. 100, 442: Quid tu, o miserrime Teddo, quid tu patria relicta inter barbaros devenisti?

vassals in their allegiance to the German crown until a new bishop could be elected.[90] Two counts, Arnulf of Valenciennes and Godfrey of Verdun, who were sent to control the situation, called in Charles, the new duke of Lower Lorraine. Charles, however, took advantage of this extraordinary opportunity by transforming Cambrai into a veritable picnic ground; he summoned his wife to enjoy the comforts of an episcopal bed, and so dissipated the revenues of the see that the two counts in disgust and anger abandoned the city to its new protector.[91] The new bishop, Rothard, Notger's candidate, had to meet a triple threat to the bishopric.[92] In addition to the castellan there was the noble, Otto of Vermandois, who not only was exacting payments from the peasantry on the bishop's holdings and from the citizens of Cambrai,[93] but also built a fort at Vinchy, so close to Cambrai that Rothard was bound to get rid of it. Supported by counts Godfrey and Arnulf, the townsmen of Cambrai and the peasants of the county, he stormed the fort and reduced it to ashes.[94] Finally, Lothar of France was threatening Cambrai, after taking Verdun in 985. Rothard succeeded in convincing him that only after Liège should be taken, and other Lorraine nobles subjugated, should Cambrai's turn come.[95]

---

[90] *Ibid.*, c. 101, 443: ut . . . vassallosque eiusdem loci ad fidelitatem imperatoris sacramento et obsidibus constringeret.

[91] *Ibid.*: Porro ille deinceps oportunitatem et gratiam loci atque sufficientiam totius alimenti nactus, uxorem sibi adfuturam esse mandavit, cui in cubiculo episcopi cum tota praesumptione lectum sterni precepit; omnesque opes in usibus episcopi exhibendas in superfluis commessationibus tota effusione consumpsit. Thesarum aecclesiae dissipabat, prebendas vendebat, immo et accelesiastici ministerii negotia emptus pretio largiri mercantibus usurpabat.

[92] *Ibid.*, c. 103, 444.

[93] *Ibid.*, 443: ut omnes agricolas villarum sed et totius urbis homines fecisset sibi tributarios.

[94] *Ibid.*: Mane itaque facto, episcopus tanta ope sustentatus, civibus quoque suis atque rusticis comitatus, locum munitionis invasit, castrumque . . . coaequavit arenis.

[95] *Ibid.*, c. 105, 445: ut prius urbe Leodecensium capta priusque aliquantis principum Lothariensium subiugatis.

The attempt of Baldwin of Flanders after Rothard's death to get the see of Cambrai for his natural son Azelin added to the variety of difficulties confronting the next bishop of Cambrai, Erluin, another of Notger's candidates, whose election we have referred to above. The intrusion of Flanders into these involved border politics called for something more than the attempts of the bishops of Cambrai, which even hitherto had met with small enough success, to preserve some sort of peace on the Scheldt. And so imperial favor began to lay firmer foundations for an ultimate episcopal victory. Valenciennes was the first object of the aggression of Baldwin. Count Arnulf and bishop Erluin were bound by a common devotion to imperial interests,[96] and besides, the bishop of Cambrai had no desire to see the count of Flanders ensconced on the right bank of the Scheldt. This attitude naturally earned him the hostility of Baldwin. When, after actually taking Valenciennes from Arnulf, Baldwin had to undergo a siege at the hands of Henry II, king Robert of France, and Richard duke of Normandy, he blamed Erluin for bringing it on, and threatened revenge upon both the bishop and his city.[97] Erluin appealed to Henry II, and when the king appeared at Ghent with an army, Baldwin abandoned Valenciennes and swore allegiance. Subsequently, however, Henry II did turn over Valenciennes to Flanders in order to pacify this frontier.[98]

It was the same Baldwin that supported the efforts of the castellan Walter to secure for his son the position originally promised to him by bishop Tetdo. Erluin, having no illusions

---

[96] *Ibid.*, c. 114, 451: cum communis deditionis sub imperatore consocio.

[97] *Ibid.*, c. 115, 452: ideoque in ipsum (bishop) et in viscera totius urbis districtam ultionem se facturum esse minatur.

[98] The *Gesta* (III, 50, 485) report later attempts on the part of Baldwin Schönbart and his rebellious son Baldwin to set up fortifications within Cambrai itself, the first attempt with the connivance of Walter; both attempts were thwarted by Bishop Gerard: Balduinum preterea comitem repressit modeste, ne sibi munitiones construeret Cameraci, Walteri corruptus fraudulentiis, . . . adiensque (young Baldwin) im-

as to what this meant for the bishopric,[99] as at least part of the condition of his consent obtained the return of Sailly, which had been seized by the castellan during the anarchy between Rothard's death and his own election. He was, however, unable to prevent the son's succession. Shortly before his death Walter summoned his soldiers to him and made them swear loyalty to support his son against the bishop.[100] It was at this moment that he secured the aid of Baldwin of Flanders. Erluin, fearing his own early death and its serious consequences for the bishopric, accepted the intervention of an uncle of young Walter, Seiher of Lens, and in return for a payment of twenty pounds of silver and a promise to maintain quiet upon Erluin's death, he was permitted to assume his father's position.[101]

In other ways Erluin was more successful in combatting his enemies. At Rome, whither he had gone for his consecration and the imperial coronation of Otto III in 996, he loudly complained before a synod of the depredations that the bishopric was suffering, and from Gregory V, with the support of Otto III, received a confirmation and an extension of his immunity privileges, which for all of the episcopal property gave him the full jurisdiction of count.[102] Upon his return from Rome he took steps to protect his holdings from the attacks of nobles from the Laon and Vermandois regions by

peratorem per eum speravit posse consequi a domno episcopo ut sibi propugnacula liceret construere in Cameraco, adversus patrem rebellaturo. Qua spe privatus est, contradicente episcopo. Cf. Reinecke, *Exkursus*, II, 227-229.

[99] *Gesta epp. Camerac.*, I, c. 117, 453: Episcopus vero patre intolerabili filium procul intolerabiliorem futurum . . . existimans.

[100] *Ibid.*: ut si forte moreretur filium . . . adversusque episcopum pertinaciter sustentarent.

[101] *Ibid.*, c. 118, 453.

[102] *Ibid.*, c. 111, 449; Dieckmeyer, 21-22; Reinecke, 26-27: Die volle gräfliche Competenz wird ihm damit zuerkannt für das Episcopium, d.h. das weltliche Gebiet der bischöflichen Kirche . . . nicht nur in der Stadt sondern auf allen Besitzungen der bischöflichen Kirche bestand nunmehr die Hoheit des Bischofs zu Recht.

building a fort, the later Cateau-Cambrésis,[103] which so prospered that in 1001 the bishop, by imperial grant, was permitted to set up there a market, with toll and minting rights, and given in addition complete local jurisdiction.[104] It was but a step now to securing the jurisdiction of count for the whole county of Cambrai, which formed the heart of the diocese. This Erluin got in 1007 from Henry II.[105] Thus step by step the jurisdiction of the bishops of Cambrai had been enlarged by the Ottonians. From the position of sharing the jurisdiction with the count in the city they had advanced to lordship within the city, lordship over all episcopal holdings, and finally over the county of Cambrai itself. Legally, their principality was established.

Actually, of course, the struggle with the advocate-castellan continued unabated. It was carried on by bishop Gerard I for the whole thirty-nine years of his government, without, however, any great amelioration of the bishop's situation. It was only his successors who were finally able to get the advocate under control. Yet Gerard's efforts were not wholly in vain. With the support of Henry II and Conrad II he was able to continue an offensive against Walter II from which only the latter's powerful French and Flemish support saved him.

It had been necessary to appoint Gerard bishop even before the actual death of Erluin, for both the house of Flanders and Walter II himself were striving to secure the bishopric for their respective candidates. On his deathbed Erluin had to listen to Walter and his men breaking into the

---

[103] *Gesta epp. Camerac.*, I, c. 112, *MGH, SS* VII, 450: in hac . . . villa (Perrona), circa quam predicti raptores gravius grassabantur, castellum muniri imperiali praecepto obtinuit, ut hoc esset obstaculum latronibus praesidiumque libertatis circum et circa rusticanis cultoribus.

[104] *MGH, DD* II, 832, No. 399; Reinecke, 27-28.

[105] *MGH*, DD III, 168, No. 142: Comitatum Chameracensem . . . in proprium donavimus precipientes igitur ut . . . episcopus suique successores liberam dehinc habeant potestatem eundem comitatum in usum aecclesiae supra dictae tenendi, comitem eligendi, pannos habendi seu quicquid sibi libeat, modis omnibus inde faciendi. Reinecke, 28-29.

episcopal residence, after having broken into the chapter house and into the bishop's own stable. Before he himself died, however, he had only the satisfaction of calling down in wrath upon this brigand the punishments of hell.[106] Not even in death was he permitted to rest in peace, for the unrestrained joy of Walter led him to join with his brother Seiher in entering the monastery where the funeral services were being held and driving the clergy at the point of the sword to take refuge at the main altar of the Virgin.[107]

Gerard was accompanied to his new see by imperial *missi*, to whom Walter alleged as an explanation of his conduct that he had been obliged to protect the city from the count of Flanders.[108] Indeed, Gerard's own frequent absences from his see on imperial business offered Walter further opportunities to secure the predominance within the city at which he aimed.[109] Beginning with the very first year of Gerard's administration, while he was away at court at Nimwegen, Walter took unscrupulous advantage of his absence and would pay no attention to orders to appear at court. When Gerard went to be consecrated in orderly German fashion at Rheims, as Henry II wished, seeing that he could hardly be consecrated at Bamberg,[111] Walter again

[106] *Gesta epp. Camerac.*, I, 118, *MGH*, *SS* VII, 453: Walterus . . . cum multitudine suorum armatus, fractis foribus domos clericorum furibundus irrupit, quas et stabula quoque episcopi raptis caballis direptioni contulit. Ad cuius furorem episcopus . . . viribus destitutis cum nimia difficultate aures intendens, alto suspirio graviter infremuit, manibusque paululum celo directis, latronem runc in die ultionis coram summo iudice condempnandum invocans, posthac cum hac indignatione . . . spiritum exalavit.

[107] *Ibid.*, c. 119, 453-454.

[108] *Ibid.*, III, c. 1, 465: non causa rapinae sed tuitionis adversus Balduini comitis impetum.

[109] *Ibid.*, c. 2, 467: Sibi enim totius rei prepotestatem penitus usurpare, episcopo vero solum nomen ac speciem honoris relinquere.

[111] Henry agreed finally to Gerard's consecration at Rheims, but when the bishop left court at Liège (*ibid.*, c. 2, 466): largitus est ei librum consecrationes clericorum et ordinationem episcopi continentem, ut per hunc videlicet consecratus, haud fortasse quidem indisciplinatis moribus Karlensium inregulariter ordinaretur.

enjoyed free reign.[112] After an imperial commission of two counts had patched up another peace between the bishop and his castellan-advocate, it required only Gerard's absence at the siege of Metz in August, 1019, to start Walter on another rampage.[113] Upon this occasion it took the king of France and Odo, the count of Champagne, to fix another truce. Gerard was continuously busy on pacific errands in the region for his very good friend Henry II, though within Cambrai he had little enough success as a pacifier. An accumulation of offenses led him ultimately to drive Walter out of the city, but he was obliged to take him back, although at the same time he exacted an oath that he would henceforth maintain his loyalty as Lotharingian soldiers were accustomed to do.[114] But no sucession of temporary truces availed. Once Gerard had to complain of being besieged for three days in his own city by his own advocate.[115] The relief that he experienced when Walter was finally murdered in 1011 can only be surmised. It required the urgings of the archbishop of Rheims and the count of Flanders, and further attacks on episcopal property by Walter's supporters, to bring him to consent to remove his excommunication and grant him burial in consecrated ground.[116]

---

[112] *Ibid.*, c. 2, 466.

[113] *Ibid.*, c. 3, 467: Nam dum episcopus . . . ad obsidionem Mettensium civitatis aliquamdiu cum imperatore moraretur, Walterus . . . bona episcopi exteriora vastavit, immo et suburbium civitatis igne consumpsit.

[114] *Ibid.*, c. 40, 481: Fidelitatem sicut tibi promisi adtendam, quamdiu tuus fuero et tua bona tenuero; et postpositis Karlensibus costumiis talem honorem tibi observabo, qualem Lotharienses milites dominis suis et episcopis. Cf. n. 111 *in re* this oblique thrust at French instability. Cf. Pirenne, I, 60, who quotes (p. 60, n. 5) from the abbot Siegfrid of Gorze, lamenting to see growing about him *ignominiosa Franciscarum ineptiarum consuetudo.*

[115] *Ibid.*, 44, 482: Non diu in supradictis promissis permansit, sed de malo in peius ruens, aecclesiam mihi commissam in direptionem et conculcationem habuit, et ita contra me se erexit, ut tribus diebus me in hac civitate cum suis satellitibus armatus obsideret et ne quis meorum hinc exire auderet.

[116] Dieckmeyer, 25; Reinecke, 44-47.

At Trier, Metz, Toul and Verdun the bishops had county jurisdiction for their cities and environs.[117] In this region Henry II made a determined effort to keep his wife's family, the Luxemburgers (Lützelbergers), from fastening their hold on the bishoprics, when their prospect of sharing in Kunigunde's inheritance began to wane after the foundation of Bamberg. Their rivals in Upper Lorraine were the ducal Bar-Ardenne house, which had held the dukedom since the split of Lorraine in 959. The bishopric of Metz had been in the hands of this house; bishop Adalbero II was the son of the first duke Frederick. Upon his death Henry II named his nephew, Adalbero III, son of the reigning duke, Dietrich, as his successor, though he was a mere lad. To administer the bishopric for him as guardian, however, Dietrich of Luxemburg, one of Kuningunde's brothers, was installed, without the king's being consulted. Dietrich was quick to get rid of the young Adalbero and to make himself bishop of Metz. Plainly the Luxemburgers were on the make, what with a queen, a duke of Bavaria and now a bishop of Metz, and Henry II, although he had reason enough to feel uncomfortable in the face of their sudden rise, was in no position to dislodge Dietrich.

When, however, in 1008 the queen's family tried also to get the archbishopric of Trier, Henry II would not tolerate it. Refusing to recognize the election of his young brother-in-law Adalbero, he turned over the archbishopric to Megingaud, who had been brought up in the loyal school of Willigis of Mainz.[118] This precipitated a feud between the king and his brothers-in-law,[119] including bishop Dietrich of Metz,

[117] Parisot, I, 190-191.

[118] Thiet., VI, 35 (Kurze, 154): Aethelbero, frater reginae et immaturus invenis, plus timore regis quam amore religionis communiter eligitur. Rex . . . uxorem dilectam caeterosque suimet familiares de episcopatu inpetrando sollicitos sprevit et Meingaudo Willigisi . . . camerario . . . eundem dedit.

[119] *Ibid.*: Propter hoc subdolae generationis furor accenditur. Palás a Trevirensibus contra regem firmatur ac terra haec hactenus pacifica crebris concremacionibus quatitur.

which lasted for nine years and brought the utmost desolation to the archdiocese of Trier. Adalbero, who had no intention of leaving Trier, fortified the royal palace and the bridge across the Moselle and awaited a siege. It came, but Henry could not drive Adalbero permanently out of the royal palace. Megingaud's efforts to keep himself in Trier [120] were likewise fruitless. For the rest of his life he administered his archdiocese from Coblenz as a guest of the king, while Adalbero retained the episcopal holdings.[121] Meanwhile the support of Adalbero by his brother, bishop Dietrich of Metz, had become so virulent that Henry was obliged in 1009 to besiege Metz, not hesitating to bring with him as allies in his fight against Christians the pagan Slav Liutizi. For Henry II this was a unique experience, to find a bishop so refractory that he had to take up arms against him. Dietrich gained additional support by granting out church property to soldiers.[122] He managed to maintain himself in the city, but the whole area was devastated in ghastly fashion.[123] It were better for Metz, says Thietmar, that Dietrich had never been born.[124] Before the death of archbishop Megingaud of Trier in 1015 archbishop Adalbero of Trier had so far relented as to return to him everything that he had kept back except the palace at Trier. This was the one case in which Henry II

---

[120] *Gesta Trever.*, c. 30, *MGH, SS* VIII, 171: 80 mansos de rebus sancti Martini, Ravengero . . . et Udelberto . . . in beneficium dedit.

[121] *Ibid.*, 172: Adalberone . . . maximam episcopii familiam retinente.

[122] *Gesta epp. Metten.*, c. 48, *MGH, SS* X, 543: Inter ipsum autem et Henricum imperatorem dissensione non modica, predia multa ecclesiastica pro auxilio distrubuit per decennium, sicut refert successio modernorum.

[123] Thietmar reports, VI, 51 (Kurze, 165), that he saw not long after the siege a list of 800 serfs of the cathedral church: quae propter famem et aliam necessitatem a patriis finibus egressa sunt absque conscientia prepositorum. *Vita Adalberonis*, II, c. 27, *MGH, SS* IV, 669: ut effugatis habitatoribus servorum et ancillarum Dei habitacula in solitutudinem et heremum vastissimam devenire cogantur. Cf. Thompson, *Feudal Germany*, 50; *The Middle Ages*, I, 391.

[124] Thietmar, VI, 51 (Kurze, 165).

failed to get his candidate for a bishopric accepted, and he was by now resolved to have done with this business at last. Upon receipt at Paderborn of the news of Megingaud's death (December 24, 1015) he rushed to Coblenz and then to Trier, and by January, 1016, had made archbishop of Trier a man who, he is reported to have told Adalbero, "can resist your madness."[125] This was Poppo, at the moment provost of Bamberg, a son of the Babenberg margrave Liutpold, "a hard-headed, hard-fisted young Franconian baron."[126] He was consecrated by Erkanbald of Mainz despite the frantic protests of Dietrich of Metz.[127] Within a few months Poppo became master of his city and his archbishopric. Adalbero was induced to give up the palace at Trier and to withdraw to a monastery. Neighboring castles began to fall at the hands of an army enlarged by the alienation of monastic property under the bishop's control.[128] The fort of the Holy Cross at the very gates of the city was destroyed, we are told, by an adaptation by one of Poppo's soldiers, Sicko, of the wooden horse of Troy.[129] By spring Poppo was free to go to Rome to receive the blessing of Benedict VIII on these and future undertakings.

In Lower Lorraine the efforts of the early eleventh century bishops were to a large extent spent in combatting the

---

[125] *Gesta Trever.*, c. 30, *MGH, SS* VIII, 172: Talem virum debeo dirigere qui tuae vesaniae sufficiat resistere.

[126] Thompson, *Feudal Germany*, 50.

[127] Thiet., VIII, 26 (Kurze, 209): Nam inperator hunc (Dietrich) scripta demonstrantem et banno id interdicentem non exaudivit, sed unctionem compleri precepit.

[128] *Gesta Trever.*, c. 31, *MGH, SS* VIII, 172-173: Hic saepius occupatus in expeditione et procinctu militum, quaedam de sancto Paulino tulit, de palatio etiam 60 monialium praebendas militibus in beneficium distribuit, Berencastel quondam Adelberonis a pradeonibus defensum destruxit, aliud quoque castellum Adelberti cuiusdam tyranni . . . ad terram deiecit. The nunnery of Pfalzel lost all its property, sufficient to support sixty sisters: Hirsch, *JB H II*, III, 30 ff.

[129] The story is told in *Gesta Trever.*, c. 31, *MGH, SS* VIII, 172-173 (and taken up by the author of the *Vita Meinwerci*, c. 142, *MGH, SS*

expansion of feudal houses now beginning to take firm root, the counts of Holland, Louvain (Brabant), Namur and Hainault. In such struggles they were usually able to count on the support of the loyal Bar-Ardenne house, from which, after the death of the last Carolingian duke Otto in 1012, came the dukes of Lower Lorraine, Godfrey of Verdun (1012-1023) and his brother Gozelo (1023-1043). Moreover, whenever there was opportunity, Henry II was to be found in the region, though in general the feudal problem on the lower Rhine was too much for him. In his absence his loyal bishops were left to their own devices,[130] and in return for their services were aided in laying foundations for their own principalities. Cambrai, Liège and Utrecht all got county grants, in addition to markets, tolls, mints, fisheries and forests.

Of the many feudal struggles that fill the annals of Lower Lorraine in Henry II's reign, it seems worth while to mention a few typical ones in which bishops played a prominent part. In the course of the resistance offered by the counts of Lou-

XI, 135-136). Sicko, as a means of showing gratitude for the refreshing wine tendered him as a tired wayfarer at the gates of the Holy Cross, stowed away in thirty wine casks thirty picked soldiers. Sixty more soldiers, in peasant garb, whose swords the casks also contained, were selected as the bearers of this munificent gift to Holy Cross. This army of ninety killed Athelbert and "reduced the castle to a solitude". *Sicko a Poppone pro victoria beneficiis illustratus est* (*ibid.*, 173). Later revisers of the *Gesta* add (*MGH, SS* VIII, 173, B.C.): Simili modo per alios principes sucs multa castella partim vi partim dolo cepit, tyrannorumque insaniam diu inpune bachantem ex parte maxima refrenavit. This is reminiscent of the tale of Notger and Chièvremont (cf. p. 125), not to say of Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves.

130 E.g., *Gesta epp. Camerac.*, III, c. 9, *MGH, SS* VII, 469, of Gerard of Cambrai: Videns autem . . . domnum imperatorem circa alia negotia occupatum, in quantum potuit salutem patriae sapienter previdit. The futility of calling for the help of neighboring nobles is well expressed by the author of the *Gesta* (III, c. 20, 472) when he says that Gerard called in vain upon Regnier of Hainault to help him get hold of a certain thieving Aldo: quia et ipse raptor raptoribus favere consueverat. Gerard, however, caught this Aldo in the monastery of St. Ghislain and sent him in custody to Adalbold of Utrecht for a year.

vain to Godfrey, the new duke, bishop Balderich of Liège found his territory dangerously exposed to the encroachments of a certain count Lantbert. When to defend himself he built a castle at Hougard, the count took up the challenge and in a battle inflicted heavy losses on the bishop.[131] In the struggle between Wichman and count Balderich for the lordship of the Hattuariergau, Balderich's demonic wife Adela found herself attacked in 1016 in their castle of Upplade near Elten by a formidable force. Henry II himself took part in the campaign, with the dukes of Lorraine and Saxony, also several bishops, Thiedrich of Münster, Adalbold of Utrecht, and Adela's own son by a former marriage, Meinwerk of Paderborn, who had no use for his murderess mother.[132] From another bishop, however, Heribert of Cologne, Balderich and Adela received aid and sustenance after the destruction of Upplade and the confiscation of Adela's property. Adalbold of Utrecht was willing to lose some horses in this set-to, but he did not intend to permit count Dietrich of Holland to usurp his property rights by establishing a fort at Dordrecht, from which he hoped to extend his territory with the aid of colonists from Frisia. The bishop was chief among the holders of fishing and hunting rights in this neighborhood; moreover, the heavy tolls that Dietrich began to collect on the lower Meuse were interfering with trade with England.[133] The howl that went up against Dietrich at Nimwegen in 1018 led Henry II to command that the fortress at Dordrecht be destroyed. When Dietrich refused to comply with the order, the troops of duke Godfrey and all four bishoprics of Lower Lorraine, Cologne, Utrecht, Liège, and Cambrai, were called out.[134] Not even physical infirmity

[131] *Gesta epp. Camerac.*, III, 5, *SS* VII, 467: Episcopus . . . cum in villa Huvardas castellum muniret, ad firmitatem videlicet pacis, ad maleficos territandos, ipse Lantbertus furoris sui obstaculum videns . . . congregata valida manu . . . non erubuit praesulem invadere.

[132] Aubin-Levison, 91-92; Hirsch, III, 41-45, 70-71.

[133] *Gesta epp. Camerac.*, III, c. 19, *SS* VII, 471: negotiatores inibi navigantes gravissimo censu constringere. Hirsch, *JB H II*, III, 97-99. Trier and Cologne also had rights in the region.

[134] *Gesta epp. Camerac., loc. cit.;* Thiet., IX, 28 (Kurze, 255).

was permitted to exempt Balderich of Liège, who was able, however, to get no farther than Herwerden, where he died on the day of the battle. The battle itself was disastrous for Dietrich's enemies. There was not a household in the surrounding provinces but lost at least one member on that day, and the Cambrai and Liège contingents were practically destroyed. This island fortress could not be attacked in the ordinary equestrian fashion. Adalbold of Utrecht, who himself barely escaped in a boat from the attack of the Frisians,[135] was forced to make an unsatisfactory peace with Dietrich, which marked rather the beginning than the end of this struggle between Utrecht and Holland.[136]

Bruno, Notger, Balderich, Adalbold, Gerard, Poppo,—these are stalwart figures standing forth during this first century of the German occupation of Lorraine as faithful fighters for the Saxon house. It is hard to see how without their assistance Lorraine could have been held for Germany. To be sure, we must again insist, they did in no permanent was check the feudal parcelization of the region. Indeed, they contributed to it in their steady, patient building up of their own principalities. But, as the personal embodiment of much that is finest in human character, and with breadth as well as narrowness of vision, they contributed an enriching, civilizing influence whose loss to the Lorraine of the tenth century it would be difficult to envisage.

[135] Thiet., IX, 28 (Kurze, 255): Episcopus autem in navicula quadam vix fugit.

[136] *Ibid.*, IX, 30 (256): in proximis tribus provinciis non supererat una domus, ubi saltem non deesset habitator unus . . . Athelboldus . . . cum Thiedrico . . . reconciliatur; et hoc venit non ex voluntate sua, sed ex necessitate summa. Non erat enim istius regionis ullus prepotens defensor, si amplius insurgeret inimicus acrior.

CHAPTER IV

BISHOPS IN ITALY

Thietmar of Merseburg had no very high opinion of Italy, neither of its climate nor of its inhabitants.[1] To whatever extent this opinion was shared by his fellow bishops, it had no deterrent effect on the German procession to Italy after 951, which continued whenever the exigencies of the situation permitted. No prospect of beatings at the hands of anti-German Roman nobles[2] nor of stonings by an enraged populace[3] nor of death from pestilence[4] or from fighting the Saracens in the south[5] seriously curtailed the participation of German bishops in this imperial enterprise. Under Otto I at least twenty-four bishops took some part in Italian affairs, either by accompanying the king to Italy or by appearing in Italy at *Reichstage* and synods or at court;[6] under

[1] Thiet., VIII, 2 (Kurze, 194): ac nostrae regionis adiit serenitates, quia aeris huius et habitatorum qualites nostris non concordant partibus. Multae sunt, pro dolor, in Romania atque in Langobardia insidiae; cunctis huc advenientibus exigua patet caritas; omne quod ibi hospites exigunt, venale est, et hoc cum dolo, multique toxico hic pereunt adhibito.

[2] *Cont. Reg.*, 964 (Kurze, 174): Octavianus . . . Otgerum Spirensem episcopum comprehensum et flagellatum aliquamdiu licet incommode secum detinuit.

[3] Heribert of Cologne upon his attempt to quiet the revolt in Pavia in 1004: de fenestra, ut causam tantae invasionis inquirit, lapidum imbre et sagittarum infusione retruditur (Thiet., VI, 7 [Kurze, 137]).

[4] Henry, archbishop of Trier, died in Italy, July 3, 964, from a pestilence which had broken out in the army (*Cont. Reg.*, 964 (Kurze, 174)).

[5] Henry of Augsburg lost his life fighting the Saracens at Capo Colonne in 982.

[6] Lantward of Minden, Otger of Speyer, Gero of Cologne, Dietrich I of Metz, Frederick of Mainz, Hartbert of Chur, Bruno of Cologne, Henry of Trier, Wicfrid of Verdun, Gauzlin of Toul, Everarchar of Liège, Rather of Liège, Adaldag of Hamburg-Bremen, Drogo of Osnabrück, Othwin of Hildesheim, Udo of Strassburg, Udalrich of Augsburg, Reginald of Eichstätt, Hatto of Mainz, Hildeward of Halberstadt, Abraham of Freising, Adalbert of Magdeburg, Frederick of Salzburg, Liudolf of Osnabrück.

Otto II, Otto III, and Henry II at least twelve,[7] nineteen,[8] and thirteen[9] bishops respectively were similarly active. Incomplete as such an enumeration must be to indicate the extent of the activity of the German episcopate in the establishment and maintenance of the empire,[10] it certainly does point to another important side of the intimacy existing between the Ottonians and their bishops. With their time and energy and wealth and health they labored in the imperial cause. At the same time there can be no doubt that we have here another clue to the generosity of the Saxon kings. When, for example, Meinwerk of Paderborn was about to go to Italy with Henry II, he did not let slip the opportunity to complain of the poverty of his church and to seek compensation for his prospective labor and expense.[11] To the location of Chur and Brixen on routes to Italy was notably due the increase in affluence of these sees. Trent also, although under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the patriarch of Aquileia, was treated as a German bishopric.

To draw the German bishops into the imperial procession to Italy could not, however, make Italy secure for Germany.

---

[7] Henry of Augsburg, Dietrich I of Metz, Giseler of Magdeburg, Hildebald of Worms, Frederick of Salzburg, Balderich of Speyer, Egbert of Trier, Notger of Liège, Wolfgang of Regensburg, Albuin of Brixen, Willigis of Mainz, Erkanbald of Strassburg.

[8] Willigis of Mainz, Hildebald of Worms, Gerbert of Rheims, Heribert of Cologne, Franko of Worms, Adalbert of Prague, Bernward of Hildesheim, Notger of Liège, Siegfrid of Augsburg, Hugo of Zeitz, Henry of Würzburg, Hartwich of Salzburg, Widerolf of Strassburg, Ruotbert of Speyer, Heimo of Verdun, Landbert of Constance, Gottschalk of Freising, Christian of Passau, Gunther of Osnabrück.

[9] Heribert of Cologne, Erkanbald of Mainz, Burchard of Worms, Eberhard of Bamberg, Eid of Meissen, Henry of Würzburg, Meinwerk of Paderborn, Werinher of Strassburg, Bruno of Augsburg, Pilgrim of Cologne, Walter of Eichstätt, Rudhard of Constance, Walter of Speyer.

[10] See Chapter VII for the part taken by German bishops in supplying troops for Italian campaigns, especially the summons of 981, pp. 214-215.

[11] *Vita Meinwerci*, c. 21, *MGH, SS* XI, 115: Meinwercus cum rege expeditionem iturus, ecclesiae sue penuria conquesta, itineris expensam labori suo congruam instanter petiit et . . . Berneshusum . . . optinuit.

Let them come in numbers with their troops, let them join with Italian clergy in political, ecclesiastical, and judicial gatherings, let them undertake important diplomatic missions, let them act as traveling *missi* of their king,[12] let even the Italian chancellery be amalgamated with the German in the person of Heribert of Cologne: the fact remained that these bishops had too much to do at home to be exclusively occupied with Italian affairs, and that there was also an Italian episcopate to be reckoned with. Moreover, Italy was no Lorraine. Here was no border province of Germans flanked by a Latin people, but a great peninsula, only the north of which was even partly German in population, while the south, still part of the Greek Empire, was threatened by the Saracens. Here was a people of essentially different stock, whom to hold with any security meant military occupation and further military conquest. Italy was not to be entered merely by crossing a great river, but only by crossing a formidable mountain barrier, beyond which there were no such centers of German influence as Cologne and Trier from which to work. There was no community of dynastic interests that made the problem of control of Italy easier. And yet these various obstacles did not seem to the Saxon emperors serious enough to deter them from making the attempt to dominate Italy. Ignoring all difficulties or failing to comprehend them, they proceeded to expand their territory, to increase their power, to accumulate royal and imperial dignities, always with a political outlook which Hartmann insists must be regarded as still barbaric.[13]

Since a full military occupation of Italy was a physical impossibility for the German state of the tenth century, it had to resort to other means to accomplish its ends. It had

[12] E.g., Pilgrim of Cologne in 1017, and possibly Notger of Liège in the last years of Otto III's reign.

[13] L. M. Hartmann, *Geschichte Italiens im Mittelalter*, IV, *Die Ottonische Herrschaft*, 39-40: . . . die gesamtpolitsche Auffassung noch als barbarisch anzusehen ist. Cf. G. von Below, *Kaiserpolitik*, 58-68; D. Schäfer, *Deutsche Geschichte*, I, 162-166; J. Haller, *The Epochs of German History*, 20-28.

to take sides in an existing social and economic conflict in Italy, and get support wherever it could find it. This conflict was similar in many respects to that which has been discussed in Germany and Lorraine: it was a struggle for the possession of land and the power that land brought between the rival secular and ecclesiastical classes. The breakup of the Carolingian administration had produced the same results in northern Italy as elsewhere, the hereditary officialdom, the upstart nobility, and interminable struggles for the throne. Out of this confusion there emerged the locally entrenched count and margrave and an episcopate with increased property holdings and increased sovereign rights. For, long before the Ottonians extended their generosity to the Italian episcopate, the various contenders for the Lombard throne had anticipated their policy of bestowing upon bishops whose support they were seeking rights that they themselves were unable to exercise. In face of peril such as the Hungarian invasions, bishops had been granted such rights within their cities as made them lords within strong fortresses.[14] Naturally this precedent was followed and notably extended by the German kings, but the difference was that in return for similar favors the Italian bishops were hardly in a position to render to the emperors such support as they got from the German bishops. The Italian bishop had also to contend at home with an important class of lesser nobility (*secundi milites*) and a special class of freemen (*Arimannen*), each struggling to preserve its existence in the social upheaval. The bishop's administration of land was accordingly much more likely than in Germany and Lorraine to be unpopular with the peasants. On the other hand, merely to support the bishops in Italy could be no such simple

[14] S. Pivano, *Stato e Chiesa da Berengario ad Arduino (888-1015)*, 62-64, points to fifteen extant Berengarian grants from 904 to 922, of which he says: In generale contengono la concessione di scavare fossi, di erigere mura, di costruire e munire castelli; e.g., 62, n. 2, for Bergamo, June 23, 904: ut pro imminenti necessitate et Paganorum incursu civitas Bergamensis reedificetur ubicumque predictus episcopus et concives necessarium duxerint.

or consistent policy as in Germany. For one thing, in the tenth century it is only in Italy that we find bishops guilty of maladministration of their sees for their own private gain, so that not infrequently the churches had to be protected by the Saxon emperors from their own bishops. Moreover, since the monasteries, especially in Middle Italy, come to be a very necessary support of the crown, much more so than in Germany, it was sometimes necessary to support them not only against the secular nobles but even against the bishops.

The best, then, that the Saxon emperors could do in this confused and complicated situation was to get such support as they could from the church. As in Germany and Lorraine, they had to create a loyal church by building up the independent position of the bishops and abbots over against the nobility, and—in Italy—to beware at the same time of letting the bishops encroach too much upon the monasteries. The emperors could from time to time come down to Italy as deliverers from secular oppression. But, inasmuch as they could not well remain very long, it was important that it began to be more and more possible to exercise control over the personnel of the episcopate, to the advantage of the German cause. Although nothing very thoroughgoing was accomplished along this line by the end of Henry II's reign, yet we can recognize the beginning of practices already in vogue both at home and in Lorraine.[15] At first the Italian bishops were taken almost exclusively from the nobility of the region. At least one third of the bishops named by Otto I can be shown to have come from the local nobility, and there is no instance where one can definitely be shown to have come from another region, not to say from outside Italy. Under Otto III a more arbitrary disposition of the sees is notable. Theophano's favorite, John of Calabria, whom some thought far too intimate with the empress, was given Piacenza, which was even made into an archbishopric for him. At Ravenna,

[15] The material of this paragraph comes largely from G. Schwartz, *Die Besetzung der Bistümer Reichsitaliens unter den sächsischen und sälischen Kaisern mit den Listen der Bischöfe*, 951-1122; 1-23 and Table A, 306.

after the faithful Gerbert of Rheims had been archbishop, we meet the first German in an Italian see, the same Saxon cardinal Frederick whom Willigis defied in the Gandersheim dispute. Henry II kept Ravenna in German hands when he turned it over to his own half-brother, Arnold, and for the important frontier patriarchate of Aquileia, which indeed came to be a German see, he imported a Bavarian cleric, Poppo.[16] More regularly than his predecessors he also appointed to Italian bishoprics clerics from other Italian regions.[17] In some cases also Italians brought up at court and trained in the chancellery or chapel were made bishops.[18]

The building up of the independent political power of the Italian episcopate by the Ottonians was in general parallel with the same tendency in Germany.[19] It was chiefly in Lombardy that this development took place, and, of course, not even there with the same rapidity. Its chief features, as in Germany, were the extension of immunity to non-episcopal holdings and the inclusion of freemen within the immunity district, with a corresponding transformation of the bishop's judicial power from a private into a public jurisdiction, without, however, infringing upon the jurisdiction of the count in criminal cases. This was a policy already actively

---

[16] Other examples of Germans in Italian sees are Richolf at Trieste, appointed by Otto III or Henry II, Arnold at Treviso and Jacob at Fiesole, both appointees of Henry II; probably also Hiltolf at Mantua and Notger at Lodi, appointees of Otto III or Henry II, and Eberhard, appointed by Henry II to Como, important as a terminus for the crossing of the Alps. Schwartz, 306.

[17] There are four or five examples. Of the 148 nominations to Italian sees made from 951 to 1024, forty-two are known to have been from the local region of the see.

[18] From the Italian chancellery of Otto I came bishops of Bergamo and Pavia; of Otto II, a bishop of Tortona; of Otto III, bishops of Piacenza, Vercelli and possibly Brescia. Schwartz, 3; Hartmann, IV, 54-55; Stumpf, II, 8, 49, 76.

[19] Hegel, *Geschichte der Städteverfassung von Italien seit der Zeit der römischen Herrschaft bis zum Ausgang des zwölften Jahrhunderts*, II, 55-80; Hartmann, IV, 55-60; Schwartz, 11-12; Pivano, 284-290; Fisher, II, 138-139, 149; C. W. Previté-Orton in *Cam. Med. Hist.*, III, 165.

pursued by the Lombard kings, who went far also in granting to bishops complete dominion within their own cities. What went on under the Saxon dynasty, therefore, amounted to a strengthening of their hold within the episcopal city by grants of all public property and rights, and finally by the complete exclusion of the count from the city and a definitely prescribed circuit outside. This would give the bishop the jurisdiction of a count, or even put him on the same footing as a *comes palatii* or a royal *missus*.[20] These geographical areas about the city were sometimes enlarged,[21] and ulti-

[20] E.g., the grant to Reggio (*MGH, DD* I, 344, No. 242): omnem terram ipsius comitatus et publicam funccionem cum teloneo et stratatico et muris in circuitu et fossato et alveum aque a quattuor miliariis intrinsecus et extrinsecus sursum et deorsum. Cf. Pivano, 163, n. 2; Pöschl, 15, n. 9. For Asti (*MGH, DD* I, 513, No. 374): omnes plebes cortes, Castellum vetus integre, cetera quoque castella . . . et integerrime districtum et theloneum ipsius civitatis in circuitu et circumquaque usque ad quatuor miliaria . . . ut omnis incola seu colonus atque habitator et residens terre et terrarum atque ullius castri . . . a nullo homine per placitum aut per legem distringatur dilanietur nisi ante . . . presulis suique missi presentiam. Cf. Pivano, 183, n. 3. For Cremona (*MGH, DD* I, 582, No. 429): quicquid . . . de . . . civitate ad publicam functionem pertinuit, tam de parte ipsius civitatis comitatus quam de parte curtis Sexpilas, nec non ripam cum menibus et turribus . . . seu etiam omnia que a . . . antecessoribus nostris sunt concessa, nominative circa civitatem per quinque miliariorum spatia. Cf. Pivano, 184. For Asti (*MGH, DD* I, 355, No. 247): districtum mercatum atque omnem publicam functionem suae possidet civitatis et circumcirca infra duo miliaria coniacentia. Cf. Dümmler, 342, n. 4.

Grants extending rights of *comes palatii* or *missus*. For Parma (*MGH, DD* I, 334, No. 239): habeat . . . episcopus licentiam tamquam nostri comes palatii distringendi et definiendi vel deliberandi omnes res et familias tam omnium clericorum eiusdem episcopii quam et omnium hominium habitantium infra predictam civitatem. Cf. Pivano, 163, n. 1; Pöschl, 15, n. 9. For Lodi (*MGH, DD* II, 298, No. 256): iure publico statuentes ut omnes querelas et intentiones omnium hominum in ipsa civitate degentium et habitancium episcopus ipsius civitatis aut missus quem ipse delegaverit, noster et regius existens missus ita definiat legaliter tamquam si nostri comitis palatii adesset ibi presentia. Cf. Pöschl, 15, n. 10.

[21] E.g., Reggio from a radius of three to a radius of four miles; Asti from two to four. Pivano, 284 ff.

mately entire counties were given over to the bishops.[22] Along with all this went continual grants permitting the bishops to maintain their military power by the erection of castles.[23] Ravenna came to be the most powerful of the Italian sees, controlling eleven counties in the Romagna and exercising complete power over the city of Ravenna and over all bishoprics and monasteries and their properties within the archdiocese.[24] Outside of northern Italy the advance of the bishops is not noticeable. In Tuscany, where there were strong margraves, this extension of immunity grants was not particularly common; special care was lavished rather on the monasteries, which were here the principal imperial support. For that matter, the actual number of grants for all Italy to monasteries during the whole period from 951 to 1024 far excedes that to bishops. With a fast disappearing royal fisc in Italy, the Ottonians had many more rights than property to hand over to the bishops. They were, however, vehemently intent on supporting the church in the struggle over land with seculars,[25] of which struggle the documents often speak.[26] For example, archbishop Heribert of Cologne

[22] E.g., Otto III granted the county of Vicenza to the bishopric of Vicenza, Bobbio, Forlì and Forlimpopoli to Ravenna, Vercelli and St. Agatha to Vercelli; Henry II confirmed the grant of Val Assolo to Novara and one-half of Val Tellina to Como; Stumpf, II, Nos. 1191, p. 99, 1208, p. 101, 1264, p. 105, 1632, p. 132, 1432, p. 119.

[23] E.g., Otto II authorized five castles for Aquileia in Friuli in 983 (Stumpf, II, 74, No. 851) and three for Tortona in 979 (Pivano, 93, n. 1).

[24] *MGH, DD* II, 852, No. 418: omnem districtionem et placitum cunctorum episcopatuum pertinentium ad archiepiscopatum . . . et districtionem omnium prediorum suorum et prediorum omnium abbatiarum et monasteriorum suorum . . . in qualicunque comitatu nostri imperii. Cf. Pivano, 284-285; Pöschl, 17, n. 16; Schwartz, 16 f.; Hirsch, *JB H II*, II, 420; Bresslau, *JB H II*, III, 137-138.

[25] *MGH, DD* II, 259, No. 231: res ecclesiarum quas per totam Italiam violentorum quorundam manus diruperant suis ecclesiis restituere vehementer volentes. Cf. Pivano, 195, n. 1.

[26] *Ibid.*, for Reggio: ecclesie . . . iam dudum ab oppressoribus et devastantibus conculcate et iam pene in obprobrium et contumeliam omnium ecclesiarum redacte. For Parma (*MGH, DD* III, 89, No. 71):

had great difficulty in calming a dispute between one count Lambert and the archbishop of Ravenna.[27] One lone example we have of a struggle between burghers and their bishop; in this instance a decision in favor of the townsmen of Cremona was later reversed in favor of the bishop.[28]

The bishops themselves were often only too ready to compromise with the nobility in the alienation of their properties. For family reasons also, in a clergy often branded with the accusation of *mulierositas*,[29] or for purely financial reasons they let their property go in careless fashion. The terms of leaseholds were simply ignored by the holders; property was forcibly held longer than the allotted time, or inextricably tied up by alienation to a third party without the knowledge or consent of the grantor. This led to clamor on the part of churches suffering from such malpractices, that they be granted the right to reclaim all such property for which holders could not prove legal title, and that the right

---

Nos vero considerantes et commodum ducentes . . . per mala omnia que acciderint sepe inter comites ipsius comitatus et episcopos eiusdem ecclesie. For Novara (*MGH, DD* III, 401, No. 320): nostre fidelitatis causa multa sustinuit, famem videlicet sitim estus et frigus, et insuper et glaciosas rupes collesque satis asperos nudis pedibus persequentibus inimicis fugiendo superavit, quin etiam nunc presencialiter multa dampna Arduino devastante recepit, nam ecclesie illius sunt depredate, castra disrupta, domus everse, vinee incise, arbores decorticate. See also A. Dresdner, *Kultur- und Sittengeschichte der italienischen Geistlichkeit im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert*, 164 and notes.

[27] Hartmann, IV, 126 f.

[28] *Ibid.*, 127.

[29] Dresdner, 309.

[30] Otto II, *MGH, Const.*, I, 50, No. 23: Comperimus quod episcopi et abbates aecclesiarum possessionibus abutantur et per scripta quibusque personis attribuant, et hoc non ad utilitatem aecclesiarum sed pecuniae affinitatis et amicitiae causa. Dresdner, 347, says of this situation: Unter diesen Verhältnissen hätten die Laien in der That Engel sein müssen, um nicht in dem geistlichen Eigentume die bequemste Gelegenheit zu ihrer Bereicherung zu erblicken.

[31] The monastery of Cielo d'Oro at Pavia was granted such an *Inquisitionsrecht* by Otto III; Dresdner, 162. To Henry II the cathedral chapter at Bologna complained that their bishops were wasting their

of bishops and abbots to grant such leaseholds be restricted: they could be granted, for example, only to those actually working the soil.[32] Finally, in 998 Otto III brought the whole question to the fore by an imperial decree directed against all bishops and abbots who squandered their property. Henceforth all grants of property were to be valid only for the lifetime of the grantor; his sucessor might withdraw them all or inquire into their usefulness to church interests.[33] Yet for all this we find Henry II in 1014 ordering that all bishops and abbots shall draw up registers of their lost property, containing details as to how much property was lost and how and when, and by whom it was at the moment being held.[34] The desperate attempt of the Lombard and Piedmont bishops, supported by Benedict VIII and Henry II, in the council of Pavia of 1022, to prevent the sons of serfs of the church who had married free women from slipping into the class of freemen and taking with them church property, may be cited as a final example of the cooperation of the German king and

---

property in careless fashion, and received the right to confirm all future gifts, sales or exchanges; Hirsch, *JB H II*, II, 423. Bobbio had to be protected from the bishops of both Pavia and Tortona, and all transfers of property for fifteen years after Gerbert's departure as abbot, in 983, were simply declared illegal; Hartmann, III, 120.

[32] Otto I to the chapter at Arezzo: Quia Tuscis consuetudo est, ut accepto ab ecclesia libello in contumaciam convertantur contra ecclesiam, ita ut vix umquam constitutum reddant censum, precepimus . . . ut nullus episcopus vel canonicus libellum aut aliquod scriptum alicui homini faciat nisi laborantibus, qui fructum terrae ecclesiae . . . reddant sine molestia et contradictione. Quoted by Hirsch, *JB H II*, II, 361, n. 3.

[33] *MGH, Const.*, I, 50, No. 23: Proinde quia status aecclesiarum Dei annullatur, nostraque imperialis maiestas non minus patitur detrimentum, dum subditi nobis debita non possunt exhibere obsequia, constituimus . . . ut sit ei libera facultas, omnia quae per libellos vel per alia quelibet scripta abalienata fuerunt, in proprium ius aecclesiae revocare. Cf. Hartmann, IV, 120-121.

[34] *Hugonis Farf. Opus.*, 1014 Ian., *MGH, SS* XI, 542: Imperator . . . precepit cunctis abbatibus et episcopis, ut scriberent res perditas suarum aecclesiarum, qualiter et quando perdiderint vel a quibus detinerentur. Quod et ego feci. Cf. Hauck, III, 435, n. 1.

the Italian episcopate in preserving the landed wealth of the church.[35]

Better perhaps than any attempt at a summary of Ottonian procedure in Italy, the life of bishop Leo of Vercelli illustrates the difficulties inherent in any German attempt to hold Italy and the important part played by the bishops in that attempt. In this one man's career are exemplified alike all the forces tending to build up or to tear down the empire, as well as all those disruptive internal tendencies that formed the very core of the imperial problem in Italy, the hostility between clergy and laity and the efforts of the bishops to take advantage of the immediate situation to further their own interests. If we may choose the career of "the father of his country," Bruno, as typical of one phase of the bishops' relation to the expansionist policy of the Saxon dynasty, then that of Leo, "*episcopus imperii*," as he chose to call himself,[36] may well be taken as typical of another. It is possible that Leo was a German.[37] Before becoming bishop of Vercelli he had been a conspicuous figure at the court of Otto III, where he had come to know Gerbert and had had ample opportunity to become acquainted with whatever plans were brewing in his head and Otto III's. An intimate friend of a future emperor and a future pope, he was obviously a suitable candidate for a bishopric already involved in bitter con-

[35] Pope Benedict in his preliminary speech, Mansi, *Concilia*, XIX, 344: Sic ecclesia olim ditissima, incuria et malignitate praesidentium, et incorrecto ausu clericorum, pauperrima nostris est effecta temporibus . . . Hac fraude omnes filii servorum ecclesiae ad clericatum aspirant, non ut Deo serviant, sed ut scortati cum liberis mulieribus, filii eorum de famulatu ecclesiae cum omnibus bonis ecclesiae raptis quasi liberi exeant.

[36] H. Bloch, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Bischofs Leo von Vercelli* (Neues Archiv für Deutsche Geschichtskunde, XXII, II, 1897, 11-136), 104, n. 2. Warin of Modena is also called *imperialis episcopus* in 1009: "nicht ohne eine gewisse Anticipation," Hirsch, *JB H II*, III, 364, n. 2.

[37] S. Löwenfeld, *Leo von Vercelli*, 4, n. 1: Es ist wohl unzweifelhaft, dass er von Geburt ein Deutscher war. But Bloch, 78, considers it much more probable that he was a Roman. The question must apparently remain unsettled.

flict with the neighboring nobility. Sometime between the spring of 998 and May 999 he was made bishop.

The troubles of Vercelli began with the alienation of her property, "even the very graves of the dead," by married bishops interested in their families.[38] On top of this Peter, the bishop since 978, was taken prisoner in Otto II's battle with the Saracens at Capo Colonne in 982 and carried off to Egypt. He probably did not get back until 990, when he immediately set about redressing the losses of episcopal property, which his absence had naturally increased. By this procedure he was sure to incur the hostility of those who had acquired this property, the unfree peasants who had escaped from episcopal control. These appealed to the powerful margrave of Ivrea and *Pfalzgraf* of Lombardy, Arduin, who was anxious to round out his own holdings and chafed under the privileged position of the bishops, who were challenging his authority. Even among the clergy of the cathedral church Arduin had allies in the archdeacon and the archpriest, at least the former of whom had misused his office to enrich his relatives. As official protector of the discontented, under his authority as *Pfalzgraf*, Arduin attacked Vercelli during the absence of Otto III from Italy in 996-997. In the ensuing mêlée the city was plundered, the cathedral church burned, bishop Peter killed, and his body tossed into the burning ruins. A purely local incident thus became the setting for an anti-German movement. Arduin put in as Peter's successors at Vercelli two of his own candidates. He also took steps against the bishop of Ivrea, being supported in this instance also by vassals of the bishop and inhabitants of the city. In this hostile lay atmosphere the publication of Otto's Edict of Pavia of September 20, 998, simply threw all titles to church property to the wind, and those who held it under

---

[38] A document of Otto III's for Vercelli (*MGH, DD* II, 812, No. 383) condemns especially Ingo: qui pro adulterio sanctum Agatham cum servis et ancillis et ipsas mortuorum sepulturas ab ecclesia alienavit. Cf. Löwenfeld, 51, n. 1, and Hartmann, IV, 127 ff.

questionable titles were only too glad to support Arduin in his campaign against the bishops. Leo was probably already bishop of Vercelli, and it is therefore to his influence that we may attribute the bringing of Arduin before the bar of papal justice. In a letter to Gregory V, a German pope and kinsman of Otto III, he describes Arduin as having nothing divine or human in him, in fact, a bloodthirsty devil in human disguise.[39] A synod met in the spring of 999 in St. Peter's, with both Otto III and Sylvester II present. Arduin presented himself and confessed to having led those who killed bishop Peter, to having been present at his murder, to having brought these men back with him, and to having kept them and conversed with them.[40] He was assigned a terrific penance, which aimed at removing him from the political scene.[41]

But penances could be disregarded, and Arduin disregarded this one. Proclamations against him as a public enemy by Otto III did not seriously inconvenience him. Leo, however, saw to it that matters went beyond this. Out of love for his faithful friend, Otto, in a document sealed by his own hand with a golden seal,[42] turned over to Leo, in addition to Ivrea and Novara, all the confiscated property of Arduin and his followers and all the property of the shrewd archdeacon Giselbert. Molesters of the bishop's property were to be fined no less than one thousand pounds in gold. Sylvester II and the powerful margrave Hugo of Tuscany sponsored this grant.[43] Moreover, on the same day the bishop was given the most extensive rights over the county of Vercelli and that of St. Agatha, rights which made him the independent

[39] Pivano, 222, n. 4.

[40] *Ibid.*, 231.

[41] *MGH, Const.*, I, 53, No. 25: ut deinceps arma deponat, carnem non manducet, nemini virorum aut mulierum osculum donet, nec lineum vestimentum induat, et si sanus fuerit, ultra duas noctes in uno loco non moretur, nec corpus Domini accipiat nisi in exitu vitae, et in eo loco agat penitentiam ubi neminem eorum ledat qui sacramenta contra eum fecerunt; aut presens monachus efficiatur. Cf. Löwenfeld, 15, n. 4.

[42] *MGH, DD*, 751, No. 523: amore Leonis episcopi qui nobis fidei testimonio aureus est, aureo sigillo nostro iussimus insigniri.

[43] *MGH, DD* II, 749, No. 323.

master of these counties. In particular, these grants were meant to free him from the margrave of Ivrea.[44] Nor was even this all. In the next year Leo, "our most loyal bishop," was not only confirmed in the possessions of the "accursed" Arduin and those of his son, but also given all the gold mines in the counties of Vercelli and St. Agatha.[45] It was such a wealthy patrimony as this that enabled him to entertain so lavishly another of Otto III's favorites, his trusted adviser in imperial business, bishop Bernward of Hildesheim.[46] So

---

[44] *MGH, DD* II, 752, No. 324: Leoni episcopo omnibusque successoribus suis imperpetuum totum comitatum Uercellensem in integrum cum omnibus publicis pertinentiis et totum comitatum . . . sancte Agathe in perpetuum cum omnibus castellis villis piscationibus venationibus silvis pratis pascuis aquis aquarumve decursibus et cum omnibus publicis pertinentiis cum mercatis cum omnibus teloneis et cum omnibus publicis functionibus, ut . . . tam Leo . . . quam omnes sui successores . . . et in civitate Uercellensi intus et foris et in toto comitatu Uercellensi intus et foris et in toto comitatu sancte Agathe . . . liberam habeant potestatem placitum tenendi, legem omnem fatiendi, omnem publicum honorem, omnem publicam potestatem, omnem publicam actionem et omnem publicam redditionem habendi exigendi et secundum propriam voluntatem et potestatem iudicandi, quia omnem potestatem et omne dominium publicum quod ad nos inde pertinuit in potestatem et dominium sancte Uercellensis ecclesie et Leonis nostri episcopi et omnium sibi successorum . . . concessimus in perpetuum . . . ut nullus dux, nullus marchio, nec etiam Yporiensis marchio . . . nullus archiepiscopus . . . nullaque . . . magna aut parva persona . . . nullus Italicus nullusque Teutonicus audeat sanctam Uercellensem ecclesiam aut . . . Leonem . . . aut aliquem eius successorem de comitatu Uercellensi et . . . sancte Agathae . . . disvestire. Cf. Pöschl, 17, n. 14; Pivano, 232.

[45] *MGH, DD* II, 813, No. 384: Dedimus . . . sancto Eusebio et Leoni nostro fidelissimo episcopo suisque omnibus successoribus in perpetuum totum aurum quod invenitur et elaboratur infra Vercellensem episcopatum et Vercellensem comitatum et infra comitatum sancte Agathe . . . Volumus enim ut, sicut in nostram cameram aurum solitum redierat, ita deinceps in aeternum in kameram sancti Eusebii deferatur, ut . . . auro vitam eternam acquiramus.

[46] *Vita Bernwardi*, c. 27, *MGH, SS* IV, 771: Leo . . . ad suam civitatem maximo honore et affectu illum invitavit . . . praeveniensque collecto maximo cleri populique coetu, in laudem Dei cunctis psallentibus,

far as we know, this combination of papal synod, imperial decrees, and specific grants was sufficient, for a bishop like Leo, to hold Arduin within bounds until a more suitable occasion should present itself.

One's conception of the position of Leo of Vercelli must, however, be still further enlarged. He was no mere fighter against a neighboring margrave; he shared in such plans of empire and theories of the relationship of empire and papacy as filtered through the minds of Otto III and Sylvester II. Before becoming bishop he was an intimate of both of these at court. After the return of Otto and Gregory V to Rome in April 998, he was probably the *missus* who as judge presided over royal court sessions.[47] Certainly he was active as a member of the imperial-papal court in the settling of important political and ecclesiastical problems. It was at this moment that he celebrated the return of emperor and pope in a poem which might well be taken as an expression of the ideas of Otto III, with which Leo was in complete sympathy.[48] His position at court was by no means altered by the assumption of the bishopric at Vercelli. He became *logotheta* at the court of Otto III alongside of the *logotheta principalis*, Heribert. When Heribert became archbishop of Cologne, retaining, however, the joint chancellorship of the German and Italian realms, it was Leo who acted as his representative at

campanis quoque personantibus, non minori ambitu quam si papa adveniret excepto, omniaque in ministerio eius opulentissimo luxu quantum imperatum est impendit, donis quoque eximiis honoravit. Socios quoque cum illo misit, qui sequenti die hospitium plenis copiis providebant. Cf. Löwenfeld, 19.

[47] Bloch, *op. cit.*, 91 ff.

[48] The two closing stanzas (Bloch, 115) run as follows:

> Gaude papa, gaude caesar, gaudeat ecclesia;
> Sit magnum Romae gaudium, iubilet palatium;
> Sub caesaris potentia purgat papa secula. Christe.
>
> Vos duo luminaria, per terrarum spacia
> Illustrate ecclesias, effugate tenebras;
> Et unus ferro vigeat, alter verbo tinniat.

Cf. M. Ter Braak, *Kaiser Otto III, Ideal und Praxis im fruehen Mittelalter*, 109 and 119.

court while Heribert was perforce absent in the interests of his archbishopric.[49] With brilliant scholarship Bloch has shown that Leo was himself the author of all Otto's capitularies, including the momentous edict of 998 of Pavia, which satisfied so well the particular needs of Leo's diocese, and all the grants of Otto III to the bishopric of Vercelli.[50] When the nature of these grants is recalled, it is clear not only that Leo was in sympathy with the Ottonian episcopal policy in Italy, but also that he realized rather well what was good for the bishop and bishopric of Vercelli.[51]

The death of Otto III was the opportunity for which Arduin had been waiting to reassert himself. This he did in such a manner as to transform the Lombard question from a struggle between clergy and laity into a struggle for control over northern Italy and possibly the whole peninsula. Within a few weeks after Otto's death, even before he was buried at Aachen, Arduin had succeeded in having himself crowned king of the Lombards. Moreover, he had abandoned his anti-episcopal policy, which as margrave he could afford to pursue, but which as king he found it advantageous to give up. Peter, the bishop of Como, a chancellor of Otto III, appeared in the role of chancellor for the new Lombard king. His see was consequently rewarded with the important military pass of Chiavenna and the castle of Bellinzona. In addition, the archbishop of Milan and the bishops of Cremona,

[49] At least this is the persuasive argument of Bloch, 83-89.

[50] *Ibid.*, 60-71.

[51] Indeed, this trait of Leo's nature gives especial point to his reminder to Gregory V in the last line of his poem of April, 998.

> Tuos et tuam gloriam habe in memoriam,

and to two lines in the last stanza of his poem of 1002 on the death of Otto III and the accession of Henry II (Bloch, 121):

> Numquam Heinricus gaudeat, numquam felix valeat,
> Si Leonem episcopum non faciat ditissimum.

The *Vita Quinque Fratrum* (c. 10, *MGH, SS* XV, 725) speaks of a revolt against: nobilem virum . . . monachum Rothulfum, eo quod velut homo sapiens secundum seculum adiuvit Leonem episcopum de palacio, qui contendens pro fidelitate regis et suo questu multam pecuniam adquisivit in illo comitatu.

Piacenza, Pavia, Brescia, Lodi and Asti found themselves for various reasons at Arduin's side. Leo was thus left isolated in Vercelli, a lone German supporter in the west. In the east the German party was safe under the protection of the margraves Thedald of Canossa and Otto of Carinthia. The bishop of Modena was also a German, likewise archbishop Frederick of Ravenna. Bishop Otbert of Verona fortified himself against possible attack by Arduin, but it was naturally upon Leo that the brunt of Arduin's initial attack fell. He had to get out of Vercelli; he lost the property of Arduin that had been awarded him, which was given to his own provost, a chancellor of Arduin. As there was as yet no king in Germany, the best Leo could do under the circumstances was to turn to Rome for a confirmation of all his earlier privileges, which, if only they were regarded, provided for Vercelli an unheard-of degree of security.[52]

As soon as there was a king in Germany, there was but one thing to do. Leo went to court, no doubt taking in his luggage the poem he had written for the occasion, urging Henry II to come to Italy.[53] His efforts, although seconded by the bishop of Verona, resulted only in Henry's entrusting the campaign to Otto of Carinthia, who was to cooperate with margrave Thedald of Canossa and archbishop Frederick of Ravenna. The ensuing encounter at Fabricca, in January 1003, was a disaster for the German party,[54] and after further urgings from Leo and his north Italian supporters Henry

[52] Löwenfeld, 23, n. 3: ut nemo viventium imperator aut rex marchio seu comes nullus italicus nullusque teutonicus aut aliqua quecumque persona qualibet temeritate aut ingenii molimine audeat suprafate basilice ullam contrarietatem aut molestiam quandoque inferre.

[53] Löwenfeld, 26, n. 1; Bloch, 121:

> Regum creatrix maxima clamat iam Italia:
> 'Heinrice, curre, propera, te expectant omnia.
> Numquam sinas te principe Arduinum vivere.'
>
> Currunt isti, currunt illi, fit concursus omnium;
> Germania et Belgica torva curvant genua,
> Currit Leo et patriam credit Baioariam.

[54] Hartmann, IV, 160 ff.; Bloch, 100-101; Löwenfeld, 20-24.

did appear in Italy in the spring of 1004. Although after having himself crowned Lombard king on May 14, he left for Germany in June, he had succeeded with little difficulty in breaking up Arduin's body of episcopal supporters. The archbishop of Milan was won over. Arduin's bishops in Como, Cremona, and Asti were supplanted by royal candidates. The two sons of the loyal Tado of Verona, who was given the county of Garda, were given, one the county of Verona, the other—later—the bishopric of Verona. The only untoward incident of this triumphant and otherwise orderly campaign was the uprising of the citizens of Pavia, which brought upon Heribert of Cologne a hail of stones and arrows.[55] Leo's enjoyment of these events is not chronicled for us.

Certainly they by no means softened Arduin's hostility toward him, for upon Henry's departure Arduin attacked Vercelli and drove Leo out, besieged Novara, and invaded the territory of Como. But Leo was able to organize the German party about him sufficiently to recover his bishopric and force Arduin into his castle of Sparrone, where he was besieged persistently by Leo for a whole year.[56] It was not taken, but Arduin was unable for the time being to take the offensive. When Henry II appeared for the second time in Italy late in 1013, Arduin offered terms of submission which were turned down. Leo was still bishop of Vercelli.[57] Again after Henry's departure in May 1014, Arduin began a new offensive with an attack on Vercelli, from which Leo barely escaped

---

[55] *Vide supra*, n. 3.

[56] A poem of Benzo, *MGH, SS* XI, 635:

> Leo ille Vercellensis ornans totum seculum, . . .
> Pro aecclesiis pugnavit, animo et corpore.
> Ardoinum, qui se regem dicebat in gentibus,
> Diademate privavit sparonistis flentibus;
> Pax in coelo, pax in terra, angelis gaudentibus.

Cf. Löwenfeld, *Beilage*, II, 69-70; Hirsch, II, 437, n. 4.

[57] This paragraph is based on Löwenfeld, 29-34, and Hartmann, IV, 166-184.

with his life,[58] followed by further depredations on the bishops of Novara, Como and Pavia. This time Arduin was joined by all the disaffected nobility of northern Italy and by bishop Hieronymus of Vicenza, who joined also in the plundering.[59] It was, however, a revolt of short duration. Within three months after Henry's return to Germany, Leo was again in possession of Vercelli, and four of the margraves associated with Arduin were prisoners in the hands of the imperial party. Leo himself had the gratifying distinction of conducting two of these margraves to the king for trial and participating in their condemnation. Their properties in Italy were confiscated and turned over to the loyal bishops of Vercelli, Pavia, Como, and Novara. Arduin himself, after some seventeen years of resistance, finally exchanged his royal insignia for the garb of a monk at Fruttuaria, where the next year, on December 15, 1015, he died.

Leo is given credit for this striking victory, but he was not long permitted to rest.[60] The death of Arduin had by no means removed the elements in north Italy hostile to Germany and German-minded bishops. In 1016 Leo felt obliged to write a series of letters to Henry II, reporting a still worse situation, calling for stauncher support, and reminding the king what an indispensable support he had in his bishop of Vercelli.[61] The new leaders of the Italian party, a count Ubert the Red and Manfred, a margrave from an important Turin family, who had taken possession of some of Leo's

[58] Thiet., VIII, 2 (Kurze, 194): Hardvigus ob hoc (Henry's departure) gavisus Fercellensem invasit civitatem, Leone eiusdem episcopo vix effugiente. It is interesting to note how often in Thietmar bishops barely escape with their lives.

[59] *MGH, DD* IV, 63, No. 54: Yeronimo . . . perjuro apostate, qui . . . oblitus promisse fidei Ardoino . . . associatus est . . . cum quo pariter predas et incendia in ecclesias dei fidelesque suos palam exercuit. Cf. Hirsch, *JB H II*, II, 435, n. 6.

[60] Hartmann, IV, 184-186; Bloch, 26-28; Löwenfeld, 35-38; Hirsch, *JB H II*, II, 435-440.

[61] Bloch, 17-22.

castles,[62] were talking of electing a new king,[63] and it was rumored that help was to be sought from Rudolph of Burgundy. Manfred and the son of Arduin had obliged the citizens of Ivrea to support the new movement.[64] The bishops of Como and Parma were loyal, as well as Count Tado of Verona. The archbishop of Milan was loyal, but would, Leo thought, be more loyal if he could be sure that his nephew would get a bishopric.[65] What worried Leo particularly was that negotiations were on foot with Heribert of Cologne and his brother, bishop Henry of Würzburg, looking to a marriage alliance: a niece of the German bishops was to be married to the rebel Ubert. Henry should speak to these bishops; such a marriage would be disastrous.[66] A meeting of Henry with Leo and the German party in Italy would be desirable, as they were in want of military aid. When nothing was done, and when moreover these negotiations between the Germans and Ubert continued, Leo expressed frank disappointment at the sort of support he was receiving.[67] These envoys of Ubert's were coming back from Germany with the utmost confidence, with promises even of Leo's own property, and in addition

[62] Bloch, 17: Ubertus comes mea castella adiutorio Mainfredi adhuc tenet et sacramentis et obsidibus contra me firmavit.

[63] *Ibid.*: et in tantum insaniunt et vos vilipendunt, quod alium regem facere minantur.

[64] *Ibid.*: Mainfredus cum filiis Ardoini pervasit Iporeiam et communiter cives sibi iurare fecit.

[65] *Ibid.*, 18: [U]num e[p] . . . suo nepoti quem magis pro vestra bonitate quam pro suo servitio confidit donandum. Pro deo itaque et vestra liberalitate et nostra petitione permittite sibi et per vestras litteras ei mandate. Erit enim letior et in vestro servitio nobiscum ferventior. In veritate enim, si non, nil in regno vobis valemus servire.

[66] *Ibid.*, 17: quia tali copula vestra et nostra erit [di]spersio. This earnest attempt to thwart what was apparently an attempt of Henry II to come to terms with the northern Italian rebels, through the use of episcopal mediation, prompts Hartmann, IV, 187, to say: Leo musste . . . doch nach seiner ganzen Stellung kaiserlicher also der Kaiser sein. Cf. Bloch, 38-39.

[67] *Ibid.*, 20: Semper expectavit, ut iussio vestra pacem mihi faceret et ab inimicis defenderet; sed aliter quam sperabam evenit.

were planning to take his life.[68] Indeed, in an attempt to carry out such a plan they had invaded Vercelli property and come upon Leo, who was able to beat them off only after severe fighting.[69] Following this, Leo launched an offensive on St. Agatha, whither Ubert had withdrawn, assisted by the bishops of Pavia and Novara and three margraves, and took it after a bloody struggle.[70] "On that day," he writes, "the red wolf was put to flight with all her little wolves, and after this honorable deed had been performed for you, I returned home happy and by force took back from your as well as my enemies all my land. This is the beginning of your victory, which has terrified everybody and forced them to come back to you. If now Ubert sends his son to you as a hostage, thank not him but me, who in battle conquered him and put him to rout as a common gallows bird. I ask you to treat me as an emperor should. . . . Let him have none of your favor until he shall have made amends to my church and for his attempt on my life. Now I shall see what value you put on Leo." [71]

[68] Bloch, 20: Dulces enim sermones, qui ei a vestra parte mandabantur, et fiducia meorum bonorum, que sibi promittebantur, fecerunt eum cum fiducia peccare et in consilium mortis mee audacter intrare.

[69] *Ibid.*, 20: venit super me vexillis erectis, ut me obsideret, caperet et occideret. Sed quia plures milites mecum erant quam speraret, dei gratia . . . aliquibus captis, et multis vulneratis, scutis tultis et armis . . .

[70] *Ibid.*, 21: die qua veni castellum obsedi . . . pugnavi et vi, dei gratia, expugnavi, multis occisis, plurimis vulneratis.

[71] *Ibid.*: Ea die effugata est vulpes rufa cum omnibus vulpeculis suis et ita facto vobis hoc honore letus domum redivi et omnem meam terram de manu vestrorum et meorum inimicorum violenter detraxi. Hoc est inceptio victorie vestre, que omnes terruit et ad nos coegit redire.

Nunc autem, si Ubertus ad vos mittat suum filium obsidem, non illi sed mihi gratias agite, qui eum ut fillonem sub armis devici et effugavi. Rogo itaque vestram misericordiam, ut more imperiali . . . tractetis et me habeatis. . . . vestram gratiam nullam habeat, donec ecclesie mee et morti mee satisfecerit. . . . Nunc videbo, cuius pretii apud vos erit Leo.

Leo goes on in this letter to complain to Henry that he is being made sport of because Henry would not confirm his action against certain hostile freemen in St. Agatha: Omnes inimici mei risum et derisum de

The last serious incident in this acrimonious fight was the siege of the imperial castle of Orba, which had been seized by one William and which Henry had ordered destroyed. Along with the loyal bishops and margraves Leo besieged it for fifteen days, but nothing could be accomplished, because the imperial contingent was concerned about the vintage and threatened to return home. Ultimately terms were arranged: Orba was to be burned and the garrison within was to go free.[72] At this point a general submission on the part of the rebels seems to have ensued. Pilgrim of Cologne was sent as a special imperial envoy to iron out the Italian difficulties, and in January 1017 Italian envoys at Alstedt brought the king congratulations. Only Ubert seems to have held out. As a parting gesture Leo hurled an excommunication at him in April 1019, which threw not only himself but also his wife, his son, his brother and his whole body of retainers, free or unfree, out of the church.[73]

Even the termination of this rebellion did not terminate Leo's public service, nor his persistent efforts to regain for his bishopric its rightful property. In the fall of 1019 he

---

me fecerunt, quia preceptum de quibusdam liberis, qui in Sancta Agatha contra me erant, firmare noluistis, cum enim non vultis, quod lex vult et iubet. In fact, he concludes, he must follow the advice of the proverb and protect his property himself. *Ibid.*, 21-22, 134-135.

[72] *Ibid.*, 22: Ut iussistis Urbam castellum vestrum cum illis [XV] dies obsedimus. Sed quia hoc non cepimus nec potuimus, hos est causa; erant . . . ibi milites nobiles Uuilielmi, quorum [V] milies foris erant; . . . pugnare quidem nolebant et pro vindemiis reditum semper minabantur. . . . Interim dum hec obsidio fit, Uuilielmus meum episcopatum vastavit incendit . . . Mainfredus . . . vastavit totum Iporiensem episcopatum et illos milites, qui episcopo servire voluerunt. Hoc facto, cum militibus . . . et cum episcopo Astensi versus nos iter Mainfredus cum Uuilielmo incepit et, quia vincere non potuit, colloquium mecum . . . expetivit. . . . Sevierunt vestri hostes.

[73] *Ibid.*, 107: Meminimus enim et meminisse volumus, Ubertum Rufum heresiarcham et novum demonicolam Eusebianam ecclesiam ante annos plures devastasse, predis rapinis et incendiis Eusebianos pauperes attrivisse in tantum, quod iam aliqui peregrini, solo relicto, mendicent, aliqui autem fame pressi et angustiis tabefacti aut langueant aut Tobia cessante insepulti remaneant.

was to be found at the Strassburg *Reichstag*. When Henry II appeared in Italy on his third Italian journey, Leo was constantly at his side. We find him in Verona and in the south at Chieti, Penna, and Campo di Pietra, performing the functions of an imperial *missus* in the administration of royal justice. Back in northern Italy in August 1022, it was he who wrote the speech of Benedict VIII for the synod of Pavia and drew up the provisions of the edict that proceeded from it. He had likewise composed the documents of 1014, turning over to Vercelli, Como and Pavia the confiscated property of the rebels. After the synod of Pavia he returned to his diocese to put into effect in a thoroughgoing but strictly legal fashion, its provisions: the serfs of Vercelli who had escaped from its control were to be returned to their original status. He carefully recorded his own conduct.[74] On one occasion he did not stick at falsifying documents, not to mention using force, to bring the monastery of Breme under his control.[75] Towards the new Salian dynasty he displayed the same intrepid loyalty as towards the Saxons. Along with Aribert, archbishop of Milan, he headed the opposition to the choice of an outsider instead of a German prince as Lombard king.[76] His long career in the imperial service of three German kings was terminated only by his death in 1026, just after Conrad II had paid his respects by visiting him at Vercelli.

No consideration of the secular rôle of the German episcopate would be complete without including Leo. If not himself a German, he was as German as any of the Germans. From Arduin to Ubert, from Otto III to Conrad II, he was

[74] Bloch, 108: quos (servos) . . . in hac civitate Vercellis incuria pontificum a servitio ecclesiae dei . . . a longo subtractos, praesentia iudicum, civium, affluentia residente militum, oppositis ewangeliis et libris legum, cartis contra leges factis—si quae erant—legaliter incisis . . . revocavimus, quosdam etiam nullis cartarum colluviis infectos sed tantum longo tempore stultitia praedecessorum nostrorum, qui fratres neglegentes dicti sunt, non inquisitos ad pristinum servitium reduximus.

[75] *Ibid.*, 105, f., 75.

[76] *Ibid.*, 103-104; Löwenfeld, 53-56.

to be found pursuing an undeviating path, but never in slavish subservience nor without expecting what was coming to him. Joined to his combative nature was a mind trained in the subtleties of the law and an urge for orderly administration, whether of his diocese or of Italy. If it were indeed a golden age in which he lived, as a poet said, he made it golden for the bishop of Vercelli.[77]

[77] A poem of Benzo, *MGH*, XI, 637:

Hic (bishop Warmund of Ivrea) Leonis Vercellensis extitit assecula,
Quo lucente vanescebant zypheorum nebula,
Cuius par non est in terra, nec erit in secula.
Sub Leone et Warmundo fuit aetas aurea.

Hartmann, IV, 189: der Träger der kaiserlichen Politik; Bloch, 101: Leo in der That die Seele der kaisertreuen Partei in Oberitalien; Löwenfeld, 56: Leo ist der einzige, der Arduin in Schach gehalten und ihn schliesslich zu Falle gebracht hat; der einzige, der nach Arduins Tode den Kampf mit dessen Nachfolgern nicht scheut, und der in Verein mit Aribert von Mailand nach dem Aussterben des sächsischen Hauses auch der neuen Dynastie die Anerkennung in den italienischen Ländern verschafft hat.

CHAPTER V

BISHOPS ON THE FRONTIER

The far-reaching plans of Otto I for the eastward expansion of the German state released for the German church, especially for the bishops along the frontier, various outlets for the employment of their energies.[1] There was the opportunity to make military reputations for themselves or to launch great missionary enterprises in the spirit of the martyrs. There was the opportunity to carve out for themselves large patrimonial holdings on virgin or sparsely settled soil or to undertake great colonizing schemes in this new territory. There was the possibility that out of such activities would come not only new Christians, new churches, and new income, but new dioceses to be subordinated to mother churches. In any case there were endless opportunities for the bishops to serve as agents for the dissemination of German civilization; indeed, in whatever they did they could hardly have helped ministering to that end. As fields for expansion there were the whole Scandinavian north, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden; the whole Slav region east of the Elbe and the Saale, with Prussians and Poles beyond; closer home, the Slavs of the upper Main, and beyond, the Czechs and the Slovaks; further away, the Bavarian East March, Carinthia, Styria, and beyond, the Hungarians. Yes, there was even Russia with its Swedish lords. In general it may be said that the bishops, awake to their opportunities, entered all these fields, not of course with equal enthusiasm or equal success. They were seriously restricted, not only by internal developments within these areas themselves and by the drain on their resources entailed by imperial expansion in other directions, but also by the policy of the Saxon dynasty, which after Otto I failed to offer any very consistent or steady support. Especially were they restrained by the economic and social development within Germany proper, which imposed upon them the necessity of considering first of all their own

[1] A. Brackmann, *Die Ostpolitik Ottos des Grossen*, in HZ, vol. 134, II, 242-257.

economic strength in property and soldiers, and of regarding these new opportunities in the light of means to the strengthening of their local position. They excelled rather in the conception of grand schemes than in their execution.

The archbishops of Hamburg-Bremen inherited from the days of Anskar the rich tradition of missionaries going forth to convert the Scandinavian pagans. Their metropolitan rights over all newly founded churches in the north had been officially recognized by Rome, but the activity itself had been interrupted by a succession of inconspicuous monks as archbishops and by the political ebullition of the ninth century.[2] However, after Henry I in 934 had subjugated the Danes and established the Danish-German frontier, the tradition was resumed again in archbishop Unni, who personally engaged in missionary activities in the north. In Denmark rather than to Gorm the Old he turned to his son Harold Bluetooth, from whom he at least received permission to resuscitate the Christian communities languishing in the peninsula and to engage in further evangelization.[3] His mission carried him even beyond, to the heathen Swedes, among whom he lost his life at Björkö.[4] In later years, when Adam of Bremen patriotically undertook the task of chronicling the deeds of Hamburg's bishops, the career of Unni, when compared with the indolent, vain, greedy, easy-living bishops whom he had had occasion to observe, prompted him to the indignant advice, "Go ye and do likewise."[5] Unni was indeed the last

[2] *Adam Bremensis*, I, c. 58 (Schmeidler, 57): legatio Hammaburgensis ecclesiae, pro temporis importunitate diu neglecta.

[3] *Adam Bremensis*, I, c. 59 (58): Ordinatis itaque in regno Danorum per singulas ecclesias sacerdotibus. . . . Cuius (Harold) etiam fultus adiutorio et legato omnes Danorum insulas penetravit euangelizans verbum Dei gentibus et fideles, quos invenit illuc captivatos, in Christo confortans.

[4] *Ibid.*, I, c. 60: Deinde vestigia secutus magni predicatoris Ansgarii, mare Balticum remigans non sine labore pervenit ad Bircam.

[5] *Ibid.*, I, c. 63 (60): Eia vos episcopi, qui domi sedentes gloriae lucri, ventris et somni breves delicias in primo episcopalis officii loco ponitis! Respicite, inquam, istum pauperem . . . Qui . . . exemplum dedit posteris, nulla temporum vel locorum asperitate vestram pigriciam ex-

of the Hamburg-Bremen bishops to perform the humble service of preaching to the northern heathen. For his successor upon the archiepiscopal throne for the next fifty-one years, Otto I's very good friend Adaldag,[6] it was sufficient to organize the movement from home, supervise it, give it the support that an enriched archdiocese and a friend of the king could well afford, but it was incongruous that the archbishop himself should preach to the heathen. At the same time, whereas every archbishop was interested in increasing the number of his suffragans, Hamburg-Bremen could not be said to have any suffragans. Missionary work, it accordingly appeared, should be carried on by bishops. Furthermore, it would be desirable to have some tangible aids to further German influence in Denmark. It was considerations such as these that led to the formation of three new Danish bishoprics, Schleswig, Ripen, and Aarhus. They were given, presumably by Otto I, to three Germans, Hored, Liafdag, and Reginbrand, who made their first public appearance among the German bishops at the synod of Ingelheim in 948. Subsequently, in 965, these Danish sees, like the see of any German bishop, were given immunity. Here were indeed grandiose plans for an extension of the missionary movement.

It would doubtless have been wiser for the bishops of Hamburg-Bremen to concentrate all the missionary activity of which they were then capable on the eastern frontier, and in fact the northern campaign hardly justified itself. When Harold Bluetooth, after his futile attempt in 974 to shake loose the German yoke, founded a bishopric of his own at Odensee in Fühnen, he revealed a new method of bringing Christianity to the northern peoples: it might be done by

cusari posse, cum per tanta pericula maris et terrae feroces aquilonis populos ipse pertransiens ministerium legationis suae tanto impleret studio, ut in ultimis terrae finibus expirans animam suam poneret pro Christo.

[6] *Adam Bremensis*, II, c. 2 (62): Cuius (Otto I) ita usus est familiaritate, quod a latere eius raro unquam divelleretur.

their own kings. Harold died a Christian, probably as the result of the influence of the new German bishops. One of them, Liafdag, was active for a while in Norway under Hakon, Jarl of Trondhjem. Poppo of Schleswig, who was sent by archbishop Liäwizo to Eric the Victorious of Sweden and Denmark, may well have been responsible for his temporary conversion.[7] But the heathen reaction that came with Sweyn Forkbeard drove all these bishops out. There were no more bishops sent to Aarhus, and Ekkehard of Schleswig spent his time in the service of Bernward of Hildesheim in the course of the Gandersheim dispute, without ever going to his diocese at all. It was, however, the English church that finally forestalled the possible expansion of the diocese of Hamburg-Bremen into Denmark, Norway and Sweden. Indeed, there was little left to do by archbishop Unwan's time but to preserve formal metropolitan rights over the English bishops introduced by the northern kings into their realms. This he did both with the determination and yet with the gracious and generous air of the distinguished churchman and noble that he was. Hamburg-Bremen was not, he resolved, to be shut off completely from possible future influence and expansion, as Magdeburg had been by the setting up of the independent Polish archbishopric of Gnesen in 1000, or Passau by the Hungarian archbishopric of Gran. The blow at German influence that Unwan saw in Knut's appointment of three English bishops for Schonen, Fühnen and Seeland he met by detaining Gerbrand of Seeland as he passed through Hamburg territory on his way to his see and obliging him to acknowledge himself a suffragan of Hamburg-Bremen. This he did so convincingly that Gerbrand acted as his emissary to the great Knut, who was ready to admit Unwan's metropolitan rights.[8] Olaf the Fat of Norway sent four English

[7] A Saxon priest Frederick was a missionary in Iceland 991-996, and a pugnacious German Dankbrand was court chaplain for Olaf Tryggwason in Norway after 995; Dehio, I, 138-142.

[8] *Adam Bremensis*, II, c. 55 (Schmeidler, 116): Et dicitur Gerbrandum redeuntem ab Anglia cepisse, quem ab Elnodo Anglorum archiepiscopo

bishops to Unwan, supposedly to be ordained, and begged in return that Unwan should send bishops of his own.[9] Olaf of Sweden too, after setting up a bishopric at Skara, asked Unwan to choose and ordain its first bishop, Thurgot, a Swede.[10] It is, however, a long way from Adaldag's three new Danish bishoprics occupied by Germans to Unwan's ordination of English and Swedish bishops for Denmark, Norway and Sweden. In any case, rights had been preserved and friendships established with kings.[11]

On the Elbe-Saale frontier there was not even the neglected tradition of an Anskar to be revived. For two hundred years the Slav peoples beyond had lived practically untouched by German civilization or by Christianity. From Charles the Great on the Baltic Slavs were merely a pest along the frontier, or an uneasy source of tribute, or ready victims of raids to collect booty. This chronic state of petty border warfare, modified in its nature only with the appearance of a greater danger in the possible unification of the Slav world, such as the attempt of Svatopluk at the end of the ninth century or of Boleslav at the beginning of the eleventh, generated in both German and Slav a bitter and implacable hostility, which it would take almost as long to soften as it had taken originally to form. To the Germans on this frontier—and this is to say all of them, clergy as well as seculars—the Slavs became

cognovit esse ordinatum. Ille, quod necessitas persuasit, satisfaciens. fidelitatem Hammaburgensi cathedrae cum subiectione debitam spondens . . . Per quem ille (Unwan) cum muneribus congratulatus est ei (Knut) de rebus bene gestis in Anglia, sed corripuit eum de presumptione episcoporum, quos transtulit ex Anglia. Quod rex gratanter accipiens ita postmodum coniunctus est archiepiscopo, ut ex sententia eius omnia deinceps facere maluerit.

[9] *Ibid.*, II, c. 57 (118): Misit etiam nuntios ad archiepiscopum nostrum cum muneribus, petens, ut eos episcopos benigne reciperet suosque ad eum mitteret, qui rudem populum Nortmannorum in christianitate confortarent.

[10] *Ibid.*, II, c. 58 (118-119): In qua (civitate) petente . . . rege Olaph primus ab Unwano . . . Thurgot ordinatus.

[11] This paragraph is based on Dehio, I, 120-173, and Hauck, II, 80-101, 634-647, *et passim.*

the incarnation of all wickedness. Even so, in the later tenth and early eleventh centuries they were harassed by the Saxon nobility with such ferocity as to arouse the disapproval even of clerical historians, who themselves were willing to call them "greedy dogs." [12]

There was little change in feeling during the Saxon period, except that the situation was exacerbated by attempts, on the part especially of Otto I, to incorporate into the German state the Slav regions between the Elbe-Saale and the Oder, first of all by the systematic subdivision of the country into *Burgwarde*, small areas dominated by a fort, and then by the creation of five marches, one under Herman Billung in the northern Obodrite region, another under Gero on the middle Elbe, and a little later the three marches of Merseburg, Meissen and Zeitz. Having had to largely reconquer the territory once conquered by Henry I, Otto I determined upon a thorough political and economic subjection. Adopting Charles the Great's policy of having the missionary follow the flag, Otto next proceeded to set up a complete ecclesiastical organization for a region that was yet in no sense Christian. The only possibility of any common basis for German and Slav was religion; the adoption of Christianity by the Slavs would remove one of the chief elements of hostility. This German church for the Slavs, superimposed upon the foundation of *Burgward* and margrave, was in its very inception military and political. At the same time, in thus dividing the responsibility for holding and consolidating his Slavic conquests, Otto also precipitated a hostility between his two agencies which in fact did much to impede an easy assimilation of the new population.

---

[12] *Adam Bremensis*, II, c. 45 (Schmeidler, 105): sub duce Bernardo . . . qui populum Sclavorum graviter afflixit; II, 48, 108-109: Bernardus . . . per avariciam gentem Winulorum crudeliter opprimens ad necessitatem paganismi coegit; II, 42 (102), *Schol*, 28: Theodericus . . . marchio Sclavorum, cuius ignavia coegit eos fieri desertores. Thiet., III, 17 (Kurze, 58): Gentes . . . superbia Thiedrici ducis aggravatae; *ibid.*: avaris canibus.

It is significant that this new mission was not monastic but episcopal. Indeed, in its beginnings it was a counterpart of Adaldag's grand schemes for the north. At the same time as Schleswig, Ripen and Aarhus in the north, the new bishoprics of Havelburg and Brandenburg were set up in Slav territory. They were not, oddly enough, subordinated to the diocese of Hamburg-Bremen but rather to far-away Mainz. Some regard must be paid to the metropolitan rights of Mainz beyond the Elbe, and Frederick of Mainz was under any circumstances a difficult person to handle. However, Adaldag's metropolitan rights in Wend territory were recognized by the subsequent creation, possibly in 968, of a northern Slav bishopric at Oldenburg. But long before there was a bishopric at Oldenburg Otto had conceived plans of his own for the ecclesiastical organization of the Wends. They were, logically enough, to have their own archbishopric at Magdeburg and, as was later planned, three additional bishops. This threatened dislocation of all existing metropolitan and episcopal rights and holdings in the region, even for so important a task as the Germanization and Christianization of the Slavs, was opposed by every ecclesiastic concerned except Adaldag.[13] It was achieved only through the patience and dexterity of Otto I, in cooperation with a docile pope and after virtually buying off all the bishops concerned. Plainly the new bishoprics on the frontier hardly exerted a pacific influence among the bishops themselves. By 968, then, there was a new archbishopric of Magdeburg, to which belonged the new bishoprics of Merseburg, Meissen and Zeitz, and in addition Brandenburg and Havelburg. Six new bishoprics reached out, therefore, into Slav territory. At Magdeburg the appointment as first archbishop of Adalbert, who had previously been sent on a futile and dangerous mission to the Russians and might therefore be said to possess both experience and inclination, if no very great persistence,[14] and the choice as

[13] Cf. ch. II, pp. 39 ff.

[14] *Cont. Reg.*, 962 (Kurze, 172): Adalbertus Rugis ordinatus episcopus, nihil in his propter quae missus fuerat proficere valens et in-

first bishop of Merseburg of Boso, a St. Emmeram monk who had distinguished himself in missionary activities among the Slavs as an agent of the king,[15] spoke well for the sincerity with which Otto was pressing his extraordinary plans, and seemed to offer a fair prospect of success.[16]

If we accept the testimony of Adam of Bremen, there did indeed follow immediate and far-reaching results. Adaldag was very successful in the northern Obodrite area.[17] Adalbert preached with much success.[18] Giseler, the second bishop of Merseburg, himself worked as a missionary among the Winuli.[19] In fact, churches arose over the whole area, which became largely Christian.[20] But it would be dangerous to

---

aniter se fatigatum videns, revertitur, et quibusdam ex suis in reredeundo occisis ipse cum magno labore vix evasit.

[15] Boso was as a matter of fact given his choice between two of the new bishoprics: *MGH, DD* I, 503, No. 366: Et quia vir venerabilis Boso multum iam in eadem Sclavorum gente ad deum convertenda sudavit, inter Merseburgensem et Citicensem aecclesiam quam velit electionem habeat. Thietmar includes all three: II, 36 (Kurze, 42): et quia is in oriente innumeram Christo plebem predicacione assidua et baptismate vendicavit, inperatori placuit eleccionem[que] de tribus constituendis episcopatibus [ei] dedit. Boso was a pioneering type: *Ibid.*, (41): (Zeitz) in quodam saltu quod ipse construcxit . . . templum Domino de lapidibus edificat.

[16] Pflugk-Harttung, *Forschungen*, XXV, 156: Auf diese Weise war die ganze Elbe bis Hamburg hinab, d. h., zugleich die Ostgrenze, in gemessenen Zwischenräumen mit Bisthümern besetzt, in gerade genialer Weise Stützpunkte für Vertheidigung und Angriff geschaffen, letzterer ziemlich gleichbedeutend mit Christianisirung.

[17] *Adam Bremensis*, II, c. 20 (Scheidler, 75): Sclavi eo tempore studio nostri pontificis Adaldagi narrantur ad christianam religionem fere omnes conversi; II, c. 26 (86): Ecclesiae in Sclavania ubique erectae sunt; monasteria etiam virorum ac mulierum . . . constructa sunt plurima . . . absque tribus (tribes) ad christianam fidem omnes (18 tribes) fuisse conversos.

[18] *Ibid.*, II, c. 15 (71): multosque Sclavorum populos ille predicando convertit.

[19] *Ibid.*, II, c. 24 (83): vir sanctus, qui novellos Winulorum populos doctrina et virtutibus illustravit.

[20] *Ibid.*, II, c. 5 (65): baptizatusque est totus gentilium populus, ecclesiae in Sclavania tunc primum constructae; II, 23 (81): virtute magni Ottonis ad Christianitatem eo tempore omnes conversi sunt.

accept Adam's enthusiastic testimony *in toto*.[21] The outbreaks on this frontier from 983 on indicate that whatever Christianization there may have been was only of the most superficial sort and probably confined to some of the nobility. For the dioceses of Havelburg and Brandenburg we can be sure of nothing more than the existence of cathedral churches, and the choking to death of bishop Dodilo of Brandenburg in 980 affords some insight into the state of feeling at Brandenburg.[22] Around Magdeburg there was some colonization. By 1004, in addition to the cathedral church there were at least five churches within the diocese of Zeitz. Merseburg, which was particularly active, had at least thirteen churches at the time of its dissolution, and Giseler was beginning also to clear away some of the forest.[23] At Meissen there is mention of one church beside the cathedral church under the Ottos, and some evidence for pioneer work in clearing away forests and for immigration.[24] There was, however, no colonization on a large scale during this period.[25] As Thompson so well points out, economic and social conditions in Saxony did not then call for it; it was not to come until the twelfth

---

[21] Hauck, III, 136 f.; Dehio, I, 130 ff.; Schmeidler, edition of *Adam Bremensis*, 75, n. 3.

[22] Thiet., III, 17 (Kurze, 58): Dodilo . . . a suis strangulatus.

[23] *MGH, DD* II, 212, No. 186: Ad . . . locum Makkanroth dictum quem tunc noviter a fundamento silvas eruendo construxerat.

[24] *Ibid.*, 209, No. 184: Concessimus eiusdem villae iamiam Setleboresdorf (hybrid German-Slav name) dictae cultoribus de ambabus Albiae partibus liberam facultatem laborandi et inquirendi; Hauck, III, 140, n. 6, takes this to refer to clearing of forest. Cf. also Hauck, III, 137-140.

[25] Inama-Sternegg, *Deutsche Wirtschaftsgeschichte des 10. bis 12. Jahrhunderts*, II, 11: . . . bereits im 10. Jahrhunderte zahlreiche deutsche Ansiedelungen in diesen Gebieten bestanden haben müssen. He cites Helmold, *Chron. Slav.*, I, c. 88, *MGH, SS* XXI, 81: Siquidem has terras (of Margrave Albrecht) Saxones olim inhabitasse feruntur, tempore scilicet Ottonum, ut videri potest in antiquis aggeribus, qui congesti fuerant super ripas Albie in terra palustri Balsamorum, sed prevalentibus postmodum Sclavis, Saxones occisi et terra a Sclavis usque ad nostra tempora possessa.

century.[26] Nor was there any infiltration of monks at all; that did not come until the end of the eleventh century. Certainly there were no wholesale conversions; the Slavs preserved their integrity way into the twelfth century. But it would be idle to say that there were no beginnings made on what Hauck suggests was perhaps the most difficult task known to the history of missions.[27]

These beginnings, however, except for the Sorb region between the Saale and Elbe, were completely nullified by the series of Slav revolts that began upon the defeat of Otto II in southern Italy in 983. Even within the Sorb region conditions had been thrown into confusion by the ease with which, whether because Otto II thought his father's plan too grandiose, or because of the ambitions of Giseler, the bishopric of Merseburg had been dissolved.[28] Even though after its restoration by Henry II in 1004 it was especially provided with a considerable body of colonists, recruited two families from every royal manor in Saxony and Thuringia,[29] still its bishops, as Thietmar clearly shows, were more interested in recovering the pristine holdings of the bishopric than in anything else. It was nine years after he became bishop before he was led into the southeastern part of his diocese, and then it was only to ameliorate conditions brought about by his own neglect.[30] Nor did the restoration of Merseburg lead to any good feeling between its bishops and those who had been obliged to disgorge what they had received in 981. The bishops of Zeitz finally (1028-1032) decided that their see was too open to Slav attack, and snuggled up a little closer to the German frontier at Naumburg. One bishop of Meissen, Eid, refused to be buried there because he was afraid of having his grave torn open by the Slavs. But generally these bishops along the upper Elbe stuck to their sees so long as

---

[26] Thompson, *Feudal Germany*, 481-482.

[27] Hauck, III, 91: Die Aufgabe, deren Lösung Otto d. Gr. unternahm, war vielleicht die schwierigste, welche die Missionsgeschichte kennt.

[28] Cf. ch. II, pp. 42 ff.

[29] *MGH, DD* III, 258, No. 221; cf. Hauck, III, 98, n. 5.

[30] Cf. ch. II, p. 63.

there were sees to stick to, and in the history of Magdeburg there was never any interruption at all.

It was not so with the three sees farther north, Havelburg, Brandenburg and Oldenburg. To be sure, the sees were preserved, but the bishops were unable to stay in them; their rights and privileges were confirmed, but they were unable to enjoy them. At Oldenburg bishop Eziko was obliged to get out in 983, and moved far into the diocese of Mainz. His successor Folcward, likewise driven out, went to Sweden as a missionary. Reginbert, appointed to succeed him by archbishop Liäwizo of Hamburg-Bremen, could not even get back into Oldenburg, and, having difficulty in maintaining himself at Mecklenburg, went back to Saxony. His successor Bernhard, although he joined Ekkehard of Schleswig in Hildesheim, was quick to inform Henry II of the devastation of his diocese in 1018.[31] The next bishop, Reinhold, never got near Oldenburg. Hilderich of Havelburg lived in Magdeburg the life of a canon of the cathedral church, though he obtained a confirmation of the possessions and rights of his diocese.

[31] Thiet., IX, 6 (Kurze, 242): Bernardus . . . id ut primo comperit, non secularis suimet dampni sed pocius spiritualis immenso dolore commotus inperatori nostro [id] nunciare non desistit. *Adam Bremensis*, II, 49 (Schmeidler, 110), reports that Bernhard *in populo Sclavorum multum predicando fructum attulit*, but this is perhaps only Adam's way of expressing his loyalty to all things connected with the diocese of Hamburg-Bremen. Helmold, *Chron. Slav.*, I, 18, *MGH, SS* XXI, 24-25, reports a very interesting attempt of Bernhard in 1021 to get restored the property that he had lost as a result of the revolt of 1018. Duke Bernhard of Saxony, after hearing from the Slav chieftains of the diocese that they preferred to get out of the territory rather than pay more than they were then paying in tribute, finally compromised by accepting their offer to pay to the bishop two *denarii* from each Slav family and to restore two pieces of property. Bishop Bernhard then appealed to the emperor for a complete restoration of his former losses, and Henry II arranged at Werben for the restoration of further properties and the payment in lieu of tithes of a tax already imposed by Otto I for the benefit of the bishop. When this agreement was forgotten as soon as Henry II left the neighborhood, the bishop returned to Hildesheim and never went back to his diocese. Cf. Bresslau, *JB H II*, III, 183-188; Hauck, III, 647; Thompson, *Feudal Germany*, 407.

His successor, Erich, had little to do with Havelburg, spending a good deal of time at court as *imperialis cappellae custos.*[32] At Brandenburg Folcmar just escaped the onslaught of 983, which had fallen on his murdered predecessor Dodilo.[33] After him the Brandenburg bishops are difficult to trace. Indeed, whatever Christianity there had been on the middle and lower Elbe ceased to exist during the years following 983,[34] as a result of the series of bloody revolts of the outraged Slavs against the Saxon nobility and against the clergy of a religion that they regarded as the religion of the German oppressor.

How is all this to be explained? Is it the result of cowardice, indifference, greed, extortion? Are the bishops on this frontier to be set down as a striking exception to the general character of their fellow bishops in the rest of the empire? I do not think so. Neither do I wish to maintain that they were angels of light, who in unselfish devotion and resignation were trying to spread the gospel of universal love among a people they thought really unworthy to receive it. Tenth century bishops were not like that. In its inception this ecclesiastical organization was conceived as a means to conquer, not—or only subsequently—to pacify, the Wends. The episcopal seats originated in fortified places, in themselves not promising centers from which to send out messengers of sweetness and light. As will be later shown,[35] one of the chief obligations of the bishops was to furnish military contingents to the margraves and even themselves to lead troops

---

[32] Hirsch, *JB H II*, II, 294.

[33] Thiet., III, 17 (Kurze, 58): fugiente prius . . . antistite . . . Wolcmero. Clerus ibidem capitur et Dodilo . . . qui . . . tres annos iacuit tunc sepultus e tumulo eruitur et integro adhuc eius corpore ac sacerdotali apparatu . . . predatur et iterum temere reponitur; omnis aecclesie thesaurus distrahitur, et sanguis multorum miserabiliter effunditur.

[34] *Ibid.*, IX, 5 (Kurze, 242); *Adam Bremensis*, II, 42 (Schmeidler, 102-103) and II, 44 (105): Omnes igitur Sclavi qui inter Albiam et Oddaram habitant, per annos LXX et amplius christianitatem coluerunt . . . talique modo se absciderunt a corpore christi et ecclesiae.

[35] Cf. ch. VII.

against the enemy. A considerable part of their endowment consisted in *Burgwarde* and forts.[36] The clergy outside the fortified episcopal seats ministered especially to the soldiers within forts of the *Burgwarde*. Even when not actively fighting, to the Slavs they were still the hated religious abettors of a hated military and political tyranny.

Moreover, the endowment of these new bishoprics was not large to begin with. They relied on royal and not private generosity, and a very important part of their endowment always consisted in tithes to be collected from the inhabitants of the diocese. Wild, swampy or uncultivated territory, in relatively small grants, yielded at best an inadequate episcopal income, and it should not seem surprising if these frontier bishops came to lay a good deal of emphasis on tithes as an easier means of existence. In any case, to attract clergy to these frontier sees something more had to be offered them than an opportunity to do missionary work among a despised people. Like every other German bishop of those days, no doubt—and not unnaturally—to an even greater degree, they were concerned to have an opportunity to build up ecclesiastical lordships and an assured income sufficient not only to promote apostolic endeavors but to support them in comfort. We have already seen how Giseler behaved when he found Merseburg inadequate to his ambitions. Eid of Meissen spent a good deal of his time accumulating two hundred manors for his bishopric. Bernhard of Oldenburg chose to live in Hildesheim rather than to exist amidst a hostile population with what he considered an inadequate income. No one of them could even be sure that what was once acquired would not soon be swept away. Indeed, in conducting themselves like ambitious noblemen, in insisting that their endowment be steadily built up by the kings, they are hardly to be distin-

[36] This is especially true for Magdeburg, which had the forts of Pechau, Gummern and Lotzau east of the Elbe and the *Burgwarde* of Belizi, Nirechowa (given to the monastery of St. Maurice) and Driezele. Henry II gave Meissen three forts in the Milzanigau; Stumpf, Nos. 580, 1114, 1115, 1553, 1437. Two *Burgwarde*, Pritzerbe and Ziesar, were part of Brandenburg's original endowment; one, Nitzau, part of Havelburg's.

guished from any other German bishop of the time. After all, it was something to be willing to come out to this frontier at all. Life out there between the Elbe and Oder was at best insecure enough; if the bishops wished to prosper, they could also be sure that in any event there would be some suffering for them to undergo. There is also evidence that tithes and property and battle were not after all their whole concern. There must have been other Bosos than the one we know of, the first bishop of Merseburg.

Then again, it can hardly be supposed that at its best the attitude of most of these bishops towards the Slavs was so very different from that of the secular, especially the Saxon, nobility. The Slavs were not only idolatrous heathen; they were an enemy hated for centuries, and the hatred of their conquerors was not softened by their violent resistance. Nothing previously had been done on this frontier to civilize and Christianize; it was virgin territory. The mere difference of language, not to mention other cultural traits, precluded anything's being accomplished even now in a hurry. No peaceful contact of long duration had provided the basis for any mutual understanding that would modify the hostile imperialistic attitude of the conquerors, whether king or noble or clergy, or lead many Slavs to suspect that in Christianity they were being asked to accept anything more than the religion of their enemy, embodied in a clergy who were only part and parcel of the same machine of conquest.[37] The fault lay in the expectation that a bishop of the tenth century, what with all the other obligations to which he was held, could also be expected to be a missionary. He could build up an estate, he could administer it, he could protect it. He could follow the king as an active and loyal servant, he could even fight. For that matter, he could organize a

[37] As Adam of Bremen puts it, II, 5 (Schmeidler, 65), Otto I obliged the Slavs *ut tributum et christianitatem . . . libenter offerrent victori.*

missionary campaign, even though he could seldom get interested in taking the field in person in that kind of warfare.[38]

Even if Henry II, after his successful alliance with the Liutizi to check the attempts of Boleslav the Pole to unite the Slavs, had then undertaken to push the border churches into missionary activity beyond the Elbe, it would have been blocked at the Oder by the newly established Polish church. The first Polish bishopric, Posen, had been founded at about the same time as Otto's ecclesiastical organization along the Elbe. The first bishop of Posen, Jordan, was a German. Whether Posen was actually founded as a suffragan bishopric of Magdeburg is not clear, though the Polish duke at the time of the founding, Miesko I, was a tributary of the emperor. Certainly by the beginning of the eleventh century Magdeburg was claiming Posen as a suffragan bishopric.[39] It is therefore difficult not to suppose that Otto I had something to do with its foundation and that it was a part of his eastern schemes.[40] But Posen and the remaining Polish bishopries were ultimately included in the new archbishopric of Gnesen, which was set up in 1000 upon the occasion of Otto III's pilgrimage to the grave of Adalbert of Prague at Gnesen.[41] If this checked the spread of German influence into Poland, it may none the less have been done with the realization that there was plenty to do closer home.

[38] In addition to the material referred to in the notes from Hauck, Dehio, Thompson and the *Jahrbücher*, I have used also E. O. Schulze, *Die Kolonisierung und Germanisierung der Gebiete zwischen Saale und Elbe* and R. Kötzschke, *Staat und Kultur im Zeitalter der ostdeutschen Kolonisation*. Thompson's *Feudal Germany* is the pioneer work in English on this subject. I have ventured to disagree somewhat with his rather unsparing criticism of the bishops on this frontier. It should in all fairness be stated, however, that his opinion is the result of study over a much longer period than that with which I am concerned, and I venture no opinion as to the pertinence of anything I have said to any time beyond the early eleventh century.

[39] Kurze, 90, n. 1. The claim, Brackmann (*op. cit.*, 243) holds, was based upon a falsification of the early eleventh century.

[40] Brackmann, *op. cit.*, 245-246; W. Hoppe, *Das Erzstift Magdeburg und der Osten*, in HZ, 1926-1927, vol. 135, 369-382, especially 372-373.

[41] Thompson, *Feudal Germany*, 642-646.

The new archbishop of Gnesen, Gaudentius, was a brother of the martyr Adalbert, the Czech bishop of Prague and apostle to the Prussians. The use of German bishops abroad as agents of imperialism by the Saxon dynasty, although it met with plenty of opposition also in Bohemia, had perhaps more immediate success there than anywhere to the north and east. Adalbert was a kinsman of the Saxon house and a product of the Magdeburg schools, as well as an intimate friend of Otto III. But he was not made to be a bishop. He was unwelcome, as a possible German partisan, in the Bohemia of Boleslav II, and had twice been sent back to Prague upon the insistence of Willigis of Mainz, on the first occasion to stay only a year and on the second rather to betake himself to the Prussians.[42] He was the second bishop of the newly established see of Prague, which was founded in the spring of 973, the last year of Otto I's life.[43] Although Bohemia had come within the missionary province of the bishops of Regensburg, the new bishopric was assigned to the archdiocese of Mainz, possibly as compensation for the losses involved in the foundation of Magdeburg. Wolfgang, the Regensburg bishop, unlike most of his colleagues when it came to founding new sees, actually made no objection, although to be sure Regensburg was compensated for the change.[44] The first bishop of Prague had been a Saxon, Deothmar, and the second, Adalbert, was German in point of view, though not in blood. Upon his death Otto III refused to appoint a brother of the Bohemian duke and appointed instead another German, Thieddag of Corvey. When Boleslav III drove Thieddag out, the situation was fast becoming similar to that on the Elbe frontier. None the less, Henry II put in as the fourth bishop of Prague a third German, Ekkehard, formerly abbot of München-Nienburg, who, like any other German bishop, was consecrated by the archbishop of Mainz in the presence of the Kaiser.

---

[42] Thompson, *op. cit.*, 625 ff.

[43] Brackmann, *op. cit.*, 254.

[44] Riezler, I, 378; Janner, I, 379-382; Hauck, III, 196-200.

Except for the dealings of the bishops of Würzburg and Eichstätt with the Slavs in eastern Franconia and on the upper Main, the southeastern or Bavarian frontier of Germany was well taken care of, chiefly by the bishops of Regensburg, Passau and Salzburg. The typical attitude of the German towards the Slav had prevented much of anything's being done on the upper Main for over two hundred years, except to hold the people to their taxes and tithes. From a letter of Arnulf of Halberstadt to Henry of Würzburg we learn that the latter had little profit from this territory, almost all inhabited by Slavs, and that he went there very seldom.[45] Local synods thought to bring the Wends to terms with heavy punishments and seizure of goods for nonpayment of obligations.[46] It was partly as a means to remedy this neglect[47] that Henry II founded his new bishopric at Bamberg, but no matter how great their neglect had been, the bishops of Würzburg and Eichstätt could not get up any enthusiasm over the new diocese.[48] The Bavarian frontier, however, unlike the frontier along the upper Main and the Elbe, had been in process of extension from the eighth century onwards, checked only temporarily by the Avars. In the course of the ninth century Bavarian nobles, bishops and abbots, pushing on in the East March, met in Carinthia, Styria and Carniola the Slavs, especially Slovenes, who had been pushed westward by the Bulgars, and in this case the contact of German and Slav seems to have produced no such mutual revulsion as it did elsewhere.[49]

For the most part the results of this steady advance were undone by the more than half century of Hungarian incur-

[45] Jaffé, *BRG*, V, 477.

[46] E.g., the Frankfort synod, cited by Hauck, III, 420; in note 3 he quotes: Exactor publicus . . . cum sacerdote pergat ad domum huiusmodi praesumptoris et de sua facultate tanti aliquid precii, bovem sive aliud aliquid, tollat, propter quod protervus constringatur ut humiliatus a sua pravitate resipiscat. Cf. Hauck, III, 420, n. 3.

[47] Hauck, III, 418-420; Riezler, I, 425-426; Thompson, *Feudal Germany*, 476-477.

[48] Ch. II, pp. 46-48.

[49] Thompson, *op. cit.*, 583 ff.

sions. Especially was this the case in the East March and northern Carinthia. Still, the fact that bishop Drakolf of Freising traveled down the Danube to inspect his properties,[50] and that the ecclesiastical organization of Salzburg for the southeast was maintained during this half century through the activity of the *Chorbischof* Gotabert, indicates that even in the face of danger these bishops were not willing to see whole centuries of work suddenly go for nothing. But it was not until the Lechfeld in 955 that the eastern Bavarian frontier was open once more for settlement and for the extension of Christianity. The problem here was somewhat simpler than that on the Elbe and Saale. It was largely a question of recovery of properties, reorganization of parishes and reestablishment of privileges, repossession and colonization of devastated areas, fortification of new settlements against possible future attack from the Hungarians. The Slav constituency to the southeast was in no way a hindrance; German immigration was considerable and assimilation was peaceful. Moreover, the advance was carried out by the bishops not alone, but assisted by such monasteries as Kremsmünster, Tegernsee and Niederaltaich,[51] by the dukes of Carinthia and Bavaria, by the Babenberg margraves once they had got established in the East March after 976, and by the Saxon kings themselves.[52]

Most prominent in this movement were the bishops of Regensburg, Salzburg and Passau, of whom those whose individual activities are best known to us are respectively Wolfgang, Frederick, and his nephew, Pilgrim. Only less important were Freising, Seben-Brixen and Bamberg. The bishops of Seben-Brixen were busy first around Reifnitz and Villach and then in Carniola,[53] the bishops of Freising

[50] O. Kaemmel, *Die Besiedelung des deutschen Südostens vom Anfange des 10. bis gegen das Ende des 11. Jahrhunderts*, 6.

[51] Also Melk, Klosterneuberg, Heiligenkreuz, Lilienfeld, Klein-Maria-Zell, St. Peter's at Salzburg, and St. Florian.

[52] Kaemmel, 5-26; K. Schober, *Die Deutschen in Nieder-und Ober-Oesterreich, Salzburg, Steiermark, Kärnthen und Krain*, 33-41; Thompson, *op. cit.*, 590 ff.

[53] Hauck, III, 159-160.

especially in Carinthia and Carniola, where they were engaged in bringing colonists out to the frontier through the exchange of colonial lands for land in the interior.[54] Wolfgang of Regensburg, after traveling down the Danube to inspect the damage done by the Hungarians,[55] recolonized the devastated area around Steinkirchen, and sought and received from Otto II land on which to build a fort to protect these colonists from the Hungarians.[56] On the upper Fischa river, beyond the Wienerwald, an old church was found in 1020 in ruins.[57] Carinthia and Styria, where Salzburg was the leading colonizer, changed rapidly in the tenth century from Slav to German territory.[58] Frederick of Salzburg was so eager to repossess all the rights and properties that his archbishopric had ever held or laid claim to, whether in the East March, Hungary or Styria,[59] that to secure recognition of his claims he did not hesitate to resort to a little forgery.[60] Although

---

[54] *Fontes rer. Austr.*, XXXI, 41, No. 41; 52, No. 51; 67, No. 66; 70. No. 69. The first and third are agreements between the bishop and *nobilis vir*, the second and fourth between the bishop and *servus eiusdem ecclesie*. Cf. Inama-Sternegg, II, 8, n. 2.

[55] Arnold of St. Emmeram, II, 20, *MGH*, *SS* IV, 563: cum . . . rerum necessaria mutatione poscente in orientalem huius provinciae regionem iter suum pararet.

[56] *MGH*, *DD* II, 232, No. 204: Innotuit auctoritati nostrae, in terra quondam Auarorum iuxta fluviolum qui Erlaffa dicitur locum quondam esse qui Steininachiricha nominatur, quem per multa annorum curricula desertum ipse de Bauuaria missis colonis incoli fecit; qui ut tutiores ibi ab infestatione Ungrorum manere possent, petiit nostram serenitatem locum quendam inter maiorem et minorem Erlaffam situm ubi ipsi conveniunt, castellum ad construendum qui vocatur Zuisila (Wieselburg). Cf. Kaemel, 5, n. 3; Inama-Sternegg, II, 5, n. 1.

[57] *MGH*, *DD* III, 537, No. 423: in capite fluminis cuiusdam vulgari nomine Viscaha vocati . . . ubi vetustissimi antiquitus constructae aecclesiae adhuc manent muri. Cf. Kaemmel, 5, n. 3.

[58] *MGH*, *DD* I, 530, No. 389: curtem ad Vduleniduor, lingua Sclavanisca sic vocatam, Theotisce vero Nidrinhof nominatam, et L regales habas ad eandem curtem pertinentes ubicumque sibi placuerit mensurandas. Cf. Hauck, III, 155, n. 4.

[59] *MGH*, *DD* II, 185, No. 165; 319, No. 275.

[60] Widmann, I, 160; Hauck, III, 158; Hirsch, *JB H II*, I, 141.

the Hungarian property never actually came to them, the Salzburg archbishops continued to have their titles to it confirmed by the king as late as 1199.

It was the East March that constituted Passau's field of action, its property reaching to the Moravian frontier and deep into the Wienerwald. Bishop Adalbert had already begun to reestablish the authority of his see in this region, and had ominously begun to use the title of bishop of Lorch, a bishopric that had ceased to exist some four hundred years before. This was his way of laying claim to the territory of the old bishopric of Lorch along the banks of the Enns. With this start, his successor Pilgrim proceeded to fabricate the fable of an archbishopric of Lorch and to carve out for himself such a notable career that he landed finally in the *Niebelungenlied* as an uncle of Kriemhilde.[61] Here was a man whose ambition knew no bounds, whose means were chosen solely to achieve his ends. Although his uncle Frederick had done something in that line, he was the most flagrant manipulator of documents known to the history of the tenth century.[62] In the rebellions of 974 and 976-977 he had entitled himself to rich indemnification from the king for his loyal support and for the devastation wrought upon his city and his bishopric. To provide that this indemnification should take the form of what he wished to get he forged some documents. The monastery of Kremsmünster came to him partly in consequence of his forging other documents to prove that the monastery was already properly in Passau's possession because of gifts of kings Louis the Pious and Arnulf.[63] In a similar manner he got the chapel at Otting and the monastery of Mattsee.[64] On the basis of forged documents of Charlemagne, Louis the Pious and Otto I, he had his immunity confirmed, and in addition got the monastery of Niedernburg at Passau and a share of the tolls in the

[61] Ed. Bartsch, 1923, 221, 1296 ff.

[62] Dümmler, *Über die Entstehung der Lorcher Fälschungen*, in SBBA, 1898, 2.

[63] *MGH, DD* II, 125, No. 111.

[64] Riezler, I, 393, nn. 2 and 3.

city.[65] Finally, by means of forgery he secured a grant of the Ennsburg from Otto II.[66] Now the Ennsburg was built from the ruins of the old episcopal town of Lorch, and Pilgrim's scheme was to have recognized by Otto II not only that the see of Lorch had been transferred to Passau, but also that Lorch had had archiepiscopal rank. The royal chancellery, while willing to accept the former contention, unhappily found the latter a little too much to swallow.[67] Pilgrim complained to Otto III that his whole bishopric had been completely devastated by the Hungarian invasions, and that for lack of serfs he had been obliged to colonize his territory with freemen.[68] In the three synods of Lorch, Mautern and Mistelbach, between 983 and 991, he reestablished his claims to the tithes to be collected in the East March, and then set about restoring the parish organization in the Traungau.[69] In 985 a royal grant freed his colonists from all financial and judicial jurisdiction of the margrave and subjected them to his own advocate.[70] Berengar, Pilgrim's successor at Passau, got from Henry II land for the establishment of five

---

[65] *MGH, DD* II, 151, No. 135; 153, No. 136b; 155, No. 138. Cf. Riezler, I, 392, 393.

[66] *MGH, DD* II, 189, No. 167.

[67] Riezler, I, 396.

[68] *MGH, DD* II, 420, No. 21: episcopatus sui pertinentiam in orientali plaga barbarorum limiti adiacentis creberrima eorum devastatione infestari . . . conquestus est . . . , a quibus . . . adiecit tam inrecuperabili se damno lesum in interfectione et direptione aecclesiae suae familiae praeter innumerabilia depredationum et incendiorum dispendia, ut absque habitatore terra episcopii solitudine silvescat . . . ingenui qui ex inopia servorum in locis aeclesiastici patrimonii constituantur coloni. Cf. Inama-Sternegg, II, 5, n. 1.

[69] *Mon. Boica*, 28, 2, 88, CXVII.

[70] *MGH, DD* II, 420, No. 21: ut liberi, cuiuscumque conditionis sint, qui destinantur coloni in locis pertinentibus ad sanctae Patauiensis aecclesia praesulatum . . . sitis in marca actenus Luitbaldi comitis, a nostrorum ministerialium deinceps sint districtione absoluti, et quidquid noster publicus fiscus ab illis exigere vel percipere poterit, hoc totum in cunctis advocato prefatae aecclesiae potestatiue exigendum . . . condonamus. Cf. Inama-Sternegg, II, 10, n. 1.

churches in the eastern part of the East March,[71] and in 1025 from Conrad II the right to the tithes from all settlements already made or to be made in the future.[72]

Pilgrim, however, had set his hopes for himself and for his church on something far more grandiose than building up his see economically and pushing forward restoration and colonization in the East March. We must come back to his archbishopric of Lorch. He was much interested in converting the Hungarians despite what their depredations had cost Passau, and indeed they were ripe for conversion. Duke Geisa, before 970, had married a Christian princess, and there was great glory awaiting the man who should bring Hungary to Christianity. As soon as he became bishop, Pilgrim sent priests into Hungary. Otto I had bishop Bruno of Verden, whom he dispatched at the head of a German embassy to the Hungarians, stop off at Passau, where Pilgrim was to assist him in every possible way, for, as Otto reminded Pilgrim, out of this embassy might come great things for Passau.[73] Pilgrim immediately thereafter betook himself to Hungary, where he reported to the pope that the results so far accomplished were very gratifying: around 5000 Hungarians had already been baptized, and all were ready for it; German prisoners in Hungary rejoiced at the coming of German priests.[74] He was undoubtedly making headway in Hungary, and his success fired the ambition of other men, for example, Wolfgang, a monk of Maria Einsiedeln, who left his cell to go on a missionary campaign of his own to the Hungarians. Pilgrim, however, did not want too much assistance in Hungary, and as Wolfgang had not got his permission to go, he ordered him back to Passau: he was not needed in Hungary.[75] What Pilgrim did consider necessary to carry his

---

[71] *MGH, DD* III, 397, No. 317. Cf. Kaemmel, 12, n. 4.

[72] *MGH, DD* IV, 54, No. 47.

[73] *MGH, DD* I, 587, No. 434: nam si, ut apud vos sedet, prosperabitur, vobis in hoc vestrisque omnibus admodum consuletur.

[74] Hauck, III, 173-174.

[75] This same Wolfgang with Pilgrim's support later became bishop of Regensburg.

Hungarian mission to a successful conclusion was the organization of an Hungarian episcopate under the auspices of Passau. But Passau was only a bishopric itself, whereas it ought to be an archbishopric, another Magdeburg. There was already one Bavarian archbishopric at Salzburg, and there was no longer an Otto I to interest himself personally in a new colonial archbishopric.[76] There was, however, the old bishopric of Lorch, whose rights, as we have already seen, Pilgrim succeeded in having assigned to Passau. Now the pope could certainly create a new archbishopric, and could possibly be induced, on the basis of the history that Pilgrim manufactured for the bishopric of Lorch, to make Passau the new missionary archbishopric that he was sure was called for. He therefore forged five papal bulls of four previous popes, reaching back to the sixth century, which he was ready to submit, if he did not actually submit, to Benedict VI, along with a letter demanding the restoration in Passau of the archbishopric of Lorch, the restoration of seven old bishoprics in Pannonia and Moesia, dependent on Lorch, and incidently a pallium for himself, as was his due as an archbishop. As Pilgrim well knew that Salzburg would object, in one of his bulls he was careful to arrange an adjudication of previous differences between Passau and Salzburg that might well furnish a precedent for this particular situation. But his plans did not go through at Rome, just why it is impossible to say. The same plans we have already seen did not get by the chancellery. Henceforth Pilgrim had to confine his activities to the East March, and it was under other auspices that Christianity in Hungary was officially recognized by King Stephen, and the archbishopric of Gran created in 1000.[77] Passau is still only a bishopric.

[76] Brackmann, *op. cit.*, 254-255.

[77] Hauck, III, 177-182; Riezler, I, 393-396; Uhlirz, 95-100; Thompson, *Feudal Germany*, 595-596.

CHAPTER VI

THE BISHOP AS CIVIL SERVANT

The bishop has already frequently appeared in the rôle of civil servant; it would have been impossible to make a neat division of his manifold activities into categories. But simply to leave this phase of his secular activity to be inferred from incidental and indirect allusions, without any attempt at a more precise summary, would be inadequate. What has been said also of the character of Ottonian grants to bishops likewise properly belongs to a discussion of their importance as agents of government. The exercise by the bishops of sovereign rights that the king was in no position to exercise himself makes them without further ado civil servants of the first importance, although of a rather amorphous character. The taxing, minting, judicial and various administrative rights pertaining to, or granted in addition to, these sovereign rights, even if exercised by the bishops not so much as agents of the crown as in their own interest as quasi-independent lords, make of them the only large body of officials in the state. If now to this essentially private administration of sovereign rights we add their active participation in all public affairs, then it is no exaggeration to say that the bishops did constitute the officialdom of the state—in so far as we may properly use such a term at all in speaking of the German state of the tenth century, which, despite its partly hereditary, partly elective kingship, was rapidly becoming feudal. This is not to say that public service was solely an episcopal prerogative. The secular nobility likewise took part, but it is the bishops that stand out, and there was much that only they could do.

One feature of the relationship between king and bishops that is present wherever one turns is the strong undercurrent of friendly feeling that attaches the king to the individual bishop and the bishop to his king. It was indeed largely mutual confidence that lent to the Saxon monarchy such steadiness as it had, as well as a certain unity com-

pounded of the bonds of personal loyalty. The bishop is *carus, valde carus, percarus, carissimus, dilectus, dilectissimus, amicus, comes* or *familiaris;* in his service he is *fidelis, devotus, assiduus, strennus, vigilantissimus*, even *affectuosissimus*. The friendships of Otto I and Adaldag of Hamburg-Bremen, Otto II and Giseler of Merseburg and Magdeburg, Otto III and Bernward of Hildesheim, Henry II and his *Lieblingsbischof*, Meinwerk of Paderborn,[1] are only a few of many typical of the usual relationship between king and bishop, "inseparably bound together with the glue and the chain of friendship," as one bishop put it.[2] In this connection it is particularly important to remember that with almost no exceptions the bishops of the tenth century were of the nobility, the class from which the king would naturally choose his friends, and that they were in many cases the most able and in all cases the best educated—or least uneducated—of all the nobles. This intimacy we often meet in an ingratiating form. After a hard day's fighting at the Lechfeld, Otto I went to Augsburg to spend the night with Udalrich, and to console him in the loss of his brother and other kinsmen on the field of battle. On a return journey from Rome Udalrich stopped at Ravenna to make an unexpected call upon Otto and Adelheid. The emperor, who did not have time to put both his boots on, went nevertheless to meet him with only one, brought him into his bedroom and summoned the empress, whereupon they all sat down for a friendly conversation about a multitude of things. Udalrich was sent on his way with gifts and with a body guard. Over Otto's death

[1] Hirsch, *JB. H. H.*, III, 255.

[2] Arnold of Halberstadt to Henry of Würzburg (Jaffé, *BRG*, V, 474): te nemo in liberaliter serviendo sibi (Henry II) devotior, se nemo in amicabiliter accipiendo paratior . . . glutine quodam et vinculo amiciciae quasi inseparabiliter colligati fuistis. Further examples follow. (1) *Cont. Reg.*, 961 (Kurze, 170): Poppo (Würzburg) . . . episcopus regi percarus. (2) *Adam Bremensis*, I, c. 54 (Schmeidler, 55): Unni

(Hamburg-Bremen) . . . Conrado et Heinrico regibus familiaris. (3) *Ibid.*, II, 24 (82): His tribus . . . imperatoribus tam carus ac familiaris erat sanctus Adaldagus (Hamburg-Bremen) . . . ut a latere eorum vix aut raro divelleretur, sicut ostendunt precepta imperatorum ad nutum archiepiscopi disposita; *MGH, DD* I, 389, No. 274: Adaldag . . . et Landoardus . . . nostri dilectissimi consiliarii. (4) For Giseler of Merseburg, *MGH, DD* II, 182, No. 162: ob iuge fideleque servicium venerabilis . . . episcopi Kisalharii. (5) for Dietrich I of Metz, Thiet., III, 16 (Kurze, 57): amicus cesaris et valde ei carus. (6) For Pilgrim of Passau, *MGH, DD* II, 125, No. 111a: sue . . . servitutis assiduitate. (7) For Bernward of Hildesheim, *MGH, DD* II, 821, No. 390: Tum etiam parentum nostrorum alumnus, nostrarumque cunabularum primus sotius nostrique antiqui et adhuc non cessantis laboris testis semper fidelis nec non nostre puericiae ac iuventutis tam affabilis multimode literationis informator, quia nostre rei publicae statum nostrumque vivere et imperare per longa terrarum spacia visitare non piguit; *Vita Bernwardi*, c. 18, *MGH, SS* IV, 766: Hanc autem iram et indignationem archiepiscopi adversus venerandum praesulem creavit maxime praecipua familiaritas domni imperatoris, qua illum speciali devotione pietatis caeteris familiarius percoluit. Affectuosissimo namque obsequio devinxit sibi imperatorem, quia cuncta, quae ad gratiam illius competere sciebat, vigilantissimo studio obibat. (8) For Abraham of Freising, *MGH, DD* II, 463, No. 58: Abrahe . . . nostre familiaritati digne adiuncto; *ibid.*, 521, No. 109: ob . . . frequens servitium quod ipse devoto animo sepius nobis exhibuit. (9) For Burchard of Worms, *MGH, DD* III, 1, No. 1: pro eo, quod nobis devoto animo sepius servivit. (10) For Franko of Worms, *Vita Burchardi*, c. 3, *MGH, SS* IV, 833: in servitio imperatoris vigilanti animo studebat eiusque secretis saepe intererat et . . . tanta familiaritate et auctoritate, quamvis iuvenis esset, apud imperatorem habebatur, ut sine ipsius consilio raro aliquid statueretur. (11) *Vita Meinwerci*, c. 188, *MGH, SS* XI, 150: quod episcopus Meinwercus (Paderborn) plus ceteris fidelibus suis iugi devotione in servitute regia sudasset; c. 198, 153: Meinwercus . . . imperatorum devotissimus servitor et amator; c. 9, 111: Meinwercus . . . novo regi tam carnis propinquitate quam vitae sinceritate iam dudum notissimus, de karo fit karissimus, factusque est ei in negotiis publicis et privatis comes inremotissimus. (12) For Tagino of Magdeburg, *MGH, DD* III, 137, No. 111: propter strennuissimae servitutis officium, quod fidelis noster Tageni . . . non tantum nunc, verum etiam antequam ad istum ordinem promoveretur, exhibuit; Thiet., V, 44 (Kurze, 1332): carissimo Taginone. (13) *Vita Godehardi* (Hildesheim) *prior*, c. 14, *MGH, SS* XI, 178: imperatorem apud quem summa ut omnibus notum est familiaritate praeminebat . . . ad domnum imperatorem comeavit, cui semper omnium acceptissimus comes et confabulator exstitit.

Udalrich grieved as over that of his own nephew Adalbero.[3] If Dietrich of Metz after Capo Colonne in 982 did not actually save Otto II's life, he assisted him in getting out of a very nasty situation.[4] It was with the utmost care and kindness that Otto III received his old teacher and friend, Bernward of Hildesheim, in Rome in 1001; there was nothing too good for him during his long stay. Food, plate, lights, mead, even beer, were supplied in a commodious dwelling next to the Kaiser's. They parted with mutual expressions of heartfelt grief, and Bernward was sent on his way with an accompaniment of royal soldiers.[5] When Tagino became so ill at Merseburg in June 1012 that he decided it were best to go home to Magdeburg to die, he had first to bid farewell to a

[3] *Vita Oudal.*, c. 12, *MGH, SS* IV, 402: ibique cum episcopo illam noctem ducens, eique magnam consolationis relevationem faciens de . . . fratre eius, qui in bello occisus est; c. 21, 407: Imperator . . . uno pede calciato et alio adhuc incalciato, causa humilitatis et flagrantia divini amoris, eum ad suscipiendum amabiliter festinavit. Cumque in cubiculo, accersita imperatrice, suavi colloquio fruerentur; c. 26, 411: magna tristitia septus est . . . pro obitu imperatoris, cui semper fidem servavit in omnibus, cuius etiam amor pectori eius firmiter conglutinatus est.

[4] The incident is related in Hartmann, III, 80-83. After the battle Otto had been obliged for fear of capture to escape to a Greek ship off the coast, which was about to take him to Constantinople. By means of a ruse Otto induced the crew to take him to Rossano to get Theophano and treasure. At Rossano Dietrich of Metz and two soldiers were permitted on board and managed to hold off the crew while the king swam to safety.

[5] *Vita Bernwardi*, c. 19, *MGH, SS* IV, 767: festinus a palatio fere duo milaria ad Sanctum Petrum illi occurrit, benignissimeque susceptum, inter amplexus familiarissime deosculatum, ad hospitium deduxit, diuque cum illo confabulans sequenti die ad palatium illum venire rogavit nec permisit ut quantulumcumque de suo proprio in ministerium suum impenderet, sed per sex septimanas . . . sufficienter in usum sui suorumque cuncta indigua largiter ministrari praecepit . . . iuxta ubi ipse domnus imperator habitabat, splendidissimum illi habitaculum exhibebat; c. 27, 770: dici non potest, quanto moerore, quantis utrorumque lacrimis fusis, ut in publicum procedere vererentur; 771: Episcopus quoque mellito affamine ut magisteriali moderamine, ut quondam puero alludebat, agenda quaeque commemorabat. Cf. Lünztel, I, 146-155.

king whom he knew he would not see again. He had himself carried into Henry II's bedroom, where the king lay sleeping, and with bared head spoke an affectionate and moving farewell.[6] Burchard was so ill when the announcement came to him that Conrad II was about to spend some time with him at Worms that he feared he could not receive the king and furnish him the service that was a king's due. But he pulled himself together during Conrad's stay and accompanied him on his way as far as Tribur. It was the last time that he entertained a king.[7]

The bishops were the educators of the kings. Volkold, later bishop of Meissen, acted at Otto II's tutor in non-military matters.[8] When Volkold got his bishopric, Willigis succeeded him as tutor, and later also assisted in Otto III's education,[9] although among all the German bishops Bernward of Hildesheim was especially chosen by Theophano as tutor for her young son.[10] It was at Hildesheim that Bernward

---

[6] Thiet., VII, 1 (Kurze, 170): iuxta caminatam regis solio portatur suo et elevato a capite pilleo dormientem aloquitur seniorem: 'Grates tibi condignas, domine mi karissime, referat omnipotens Deus de cunctis miseracionibus tuis, [quibus] peregrinum [me] hactenus visitasti et consolatus es . . . [me enim amodo viventem non es visurus, quia iam, ut spero, viam universe carnis ingressurus. Vale igitur, domine carissime, vale in Domino!'] Cf. Henry's parting with Gerard of Cambrai at Nimwegen in 1021, *Gesta epp. Camerac.*, III, c. 13, *MGH, SS* VII, 470, and his reconciliation with Heribert of Cologne, *Vita Heriberti*, c. 10, *MGH*, IV, 248-249.

[7] *Vita Burchardi*, c. 21, *MGH, SS* IV, 844: legati regis ad eum veniebant, qui in proxima hebdomada regem esse venturum nunciabant. De hac legatione servus Dei conturbatus, pro infirmitate sua multum doluit, quia neque regem digne suscipere nec servitium se dignum pro infirmitate potuisset praebere. . . . Ita quippe omne spacium quod rex nobiscum fuerat, quasi impetratis induciis, validus erat. Discedente autem rege, Triburiam cum eo ivit, ibique tres dies mansit. Deinde accepta licentia cum abiret, regem se [ultra] non visurum multis audientibus quasi ioculando praedixit.

[8] Uhlirz, *JB O* II, 2, nn. 3 and 4.

[9] Böhmer, Willigis, 1-9.

[10] *Vita Bernwardi*, c. 2, *MGH, SS* IV, 759: . . . ad palatium se contulit, in servitium videlicet tercii Ottonis imperatoris. . . . A qua

had been trained, and it was to the Hildesheim school that the future Henry II was sent to be educated. While a boy he had also spent some time in the household of bishop Abraham of Freising, and his schooling was finally completed by Wolfgang of Regensburg.[11] In the house of Burchard of Worms the future Conrad II was brought up as a son.[12]

The archbishops of Mainz in the course of the tenth century succeeded in establishing their right to anoint and crown the newly elected king. Archbishop Heriger was turned down when he offered to perform this service for Henry I, who refused to be crowned by anybody, and at Aachen, in 936, his successor Hildebert had to contend with the rival claims of Cologne and Trier. Cologne insisted on its right because Aachen was in its diocese, while Trier insisted that it was an older seat than Mainz, and besides had been founded by the blessed apostle Peter himself. Actually, the archbishops of both Cologne and Trier assisted Hildebert in the coronation ceremonies.[13] There ensued a rivalry between Mainz and Cologne for this honor. The coronation ceremonies for the young Otto II were conducted by his uncle Bruno of Cologne, assisted by his brother William and his cousin Henry, the archbishops of Mainz and Trier—decidedly a family affair. One of the first concerns of Willigis upon his accession to

(Theophano) benignissime suscipitur atque in brevi summae familiaritatis locum apud illam obtinuit, adeo ut domnum regem fidei illius literis imbuendum moribusque instituendum consensu cunctorum procerum commendaret. Cf. Nitzsch, I, 30.

[11] *MGH, DD* III, 162, No. 136: . . . pro indulgentia bone memorie Abrahe episcopi, in cuius laribus . . . patero lenimine nutriebamur. Thiet., *Chron.* (Kurze, 107): Nutrit preclarum Wolfgangus presul alumnum. Cf. Hauck, III, 395 ff.

[12] *Vita Burchardi*, c. 7, *MGH, SS* IV, 835: Hunc vir Dei venerabilis ad se vocatum Dei timorem pariter et amorem docuit et quasi adoptivum nutrivit. Cf. Boos, I, 242 f.

[13] Widukind, II, c. 1 (Kehr, 56): Et cum quaestio esset pontificum in consecrando rege, Treverensis videlicet et Coloniae Agrippinae—illius quia antiquior sedes esset et tamquam a beato Petro apostolo fundata; istius vero, quia eius ad diocesim pertineret locus: et ob id sibi convenire arbitrati sunt huius consecrationis honorem. . . .

Mainz was to secure the recognition by Benedict VII, in 975, of the superior right of Mainz to consecrate the German kings. Yet at Aachen, on Christmas day of 983, Willigis had to give way before John, the archbishop of Ravenna, although he assisted in anointing and crowning Otto III. By 1002 Cologne was out of the picture: both Henry II and Conrad II were crowned by the archbishops of Mainz, Willigis and Aribo, and at Mainz, not at Aachen.[14]

The only regular and continuous body of officials connected with Ottonian administration was the chancellery, occupied with the preparation and certification of all documents emanating from the king. It was therefore the most important body of officials in the state. Through its hands went every detail, great or small, of public business. The chancellery required learning, even a rather specialized type of learning. It was therefore a natural monopoly of the clergy, and its headship was entrusted either to bishops or to those about to become bishops. Those associated with it acquired a training in political affairs, an insight into the workings of government, and a practical knowledge of administration that could be obtained in no other way. It was, accordingly, a political training school for the episcopate, and at the same time the one reservoir from which the Saxon kings could draw men qualified to conduct public affairs, and experienced enough to be aware of the general political background behind the immediate problems that presented themselves.[15]

As clergy the chancellery belonged to the body of *Hofclerus*, and generally to the royal chapel, of this wandering court. But even before the tenth century it had become specialized into a distinct body, leaving to the chapel the performance of religious services at court and the care of the

---

[14] Werminghoff, 51-52; Meister, 85-91; Dümmler, 322; Hirsch, *JB H II*, I, 215; Richter-Kohl, 141, 175.

[15] Stumpf, I, 9: Die Reichskanzlei, wo . . . der anwachsende geistliche Adel seine staatsmännische Bildung erhalten.. Dehio, 105: Die königliche Kapelle war . . . ein grosses Seminar für künftige Bischöfe, eine Erziehungsanstalt freilich noch mehr für den Staatsdienst als für den Kirchendienst.

religious lives of members of the court. There was no reason why members of the chapel should not be used also on various diplomatic or even military missions, and so they were at all times. Before the ninth century, however, there was no clear-cut differentiation between chancellery and chapel. Even the complete exclusion of the laity from the preparation of documents was accomplished only with the victory of the Carolingian mayors of the palace, who first began the exclusive use of clergy.[16] During the early ninth century the head of the royal chapel, who then began to be called archchaplain, exercised such a close supervision over the business of preparing documents that no development within the chancellery of a special body of officials of its own was possible. During the latter part of the ninth century, however, the archchaplains came to entrust the actual drawing up of documents to scribes and notaries, and the formal certification to the notaries, contenting themselves with the more formal and less personal supervision. The way was thus opened for the influential notary to gain permanent official recognition, which came with the title of chancellor: the chancellery proper had begun to organize itself.[17] Soon the archchaplainship became a mere honorary title. The actual title of archchancellor was an importation from Italy into the East Frankish chancellery, which we meet for the first time in 868.[18] It was assumed by the head of the chancellery proper, which by this time had made itself a completely independent body. Finally, to the office of archchancellor came to be joined also the honorary title of archchaplain. This double dignity went first to Liutbert, archbishop of Mainz, in 870, and soon developed into a fixed prerogative of the see of Mainz. The archbishops of Mainz, that is, were archchaplains and archchancellors combined, the names being used interchangeably (though they preferred the title of archchaplain) to designate the titular head of all clergy at court and the actual official finally responsible for the preparation of documents. However, no

[16] R. Thommen, *Grundbegriffe Königs- und Kaiserurkunden*, 44-47.
[17] Seeliger, *Erzkanzler und Reichskanzleien*, 7-10.
[18] Thommen, 47-48.

archbishop of the tenth century could supervise personally the preparation of every document; he could even have attempted it only when he was actually present at court. Room was therefore left for the growth into a very influential and responsible personage at court of the chancellor proper, who was charged with the regular supervision of the chancellery in the absence of the archchancellor, and in fact practically exercised it even during his presence. In this way the archchancellorship in its turn became a kind of honorary title. With the actual preparation of documents the archchancellor did not concern himself; the chancellor was the real head of the chancellery.

The consolidation and expansion of the German state in the tenth century had its repercussions upon the chancellery. Lorraine, when added to the German state in 925, was permitted to retain a special archchancellorship or archchaplainship of its own in the person of the archbishop of Trier, whose final certification was required on all documents for Lorraine. In 945 the archbishop of Salzburg was allowed to retain the same prerogative for Bavaria. Particularism thus crept into the most important office that the king had to give. When, however Bruno became archchancellor at the end of 953, these special archchaplainships ceased to exist, in itself probably another evidence of Otto I's centralizing policy. Indeed, Bruno as chancellor from 951 to 953 had already almost displaced the archchaplain for Germany proper, who seldom appears in the documents of those years. In 954 the formal inclusion of the archchaplain—the archbishop of Mainz, be it recalled—in the documents ceased altogether. However, this victory of Cologne was short-lived: in 956 the archchaplain at Mainz reappears in the certification alongside of the archchancellor at Cologne, and after Bruno's death in 965 Mainz retained henceforth unchallenged the honorary archchaplain-archchancellorship for Germany north of the Alps.[19]

[19] Seeliger, 15-16.

After Otto I's first descent into Italy in 951 two Italian bishops appear in Italian documents as archchancellors.[20] After 962 a regular Italian chancellery was set up with its own chancellor and archchancellor, although with no separate staff of notaries and scribes. The archchancellorship did not, however, pertain to any one Italian see; it was held at different times by Modena, Parma, Pavia and Como. Under Otto III a reflection of the new imperial tendencies is possibly to be seen in the union of both Italian and German chancellorships in the person of Heribert, who became Italian chancellor in 994, German chancellor in 998, and in the next year archbishop of Cologne.[21] He held his chancellorships until 1002, when his opposition to Henry II's candidacy cost him both of them. Henry II, after his experience with the Italian archchancellor, bishop Peter of Como, who supported Arduin, furthered the tendency already evident by simply dissolving the Italian chancellery and transferring all its business to the German chancellery. Beginning with Pilgrim of Cologne in 1031 the archchancellorship for Italy became the prerogative of the Cologne archbishops.[22]

At no time was the personnel of the chancellery large. The archchancellor might or might not be present at court; the chancellor was regularly present. While the actual number of notaries cannot be determined with accuracy for the tenth century, they were never very numerous, normally from one to four, although at one time under Otto I there were as many as twelve.[23] Suggested forms, however, for the final draft of a document could come from without the chancellery proper, especially from those in whose favor the document was to be drawn. Here was an excellent opportunity for forgery, which was fairly common in the tenth century, an

[20] Bruning of Asti and archbishop Manasse of Milan; cf. Hartmann, IV, 54-55.

[21] *Ibid.*, 137-138.

[22] Seeliger, 17-19; Aubin-Levison, I, 95. In 1041 a Burgundian chancellery was set up in the person of the archbishop of Trier.

[23] Thommen, 52.

art in which experience in the chancellery was invaluable.[24] The scanty personnel of the chancellery made the chancellor's a position of exceeding importance. We can easily surmise what his personal influence must have been, particularly in case he was a strong character, as he was pretty sure to be, from the number and contents of the documents issued. The chancellor was naturally bound to see things from a point of view favorable to bishops, for, as has already been pointed out, the usual reward for service in the chancellery or chapel was a bishopric. This came often only after a very long apprenticeship. Notger was appointed to Liège after thirty-two years' service; Liudolf worked twenty years in the chancellery, thirteen as chancellor, before he got Osnabrück.[25] Gunther was made chancellor in 1008, after fifteen years of service, and finally became archbishop of Salzburg in 1024.[26] A bishopric awarded to one who had not served long enough in the chancellery was a sure cause for complaint on the part of the court clergy.[27] From the chancelleries of the three Ottos and Henry II were chosen seven archbishops and eight bishops, among them some of the foremost names in the history of the times.[28]

---

[24] In addition to Pilgrim of Passau one may refer to Adaldag of Hamburg-Bremen, *der erste aber nicht der einzige Falsarius der Hamburger Kirche* (Dehio, I, 128), also to Anno of Worms (Uhlirz, *JB O II*, 35), and to a forgery of Salzburg (Hirsch, *JB H II*, I, 98). Indeed, Dehio continues (I, 128): Fortan blieb die Urkundenfälschung ein wichtiger Handgriff in der Staatskunst unserer Erzbischöfe, und gerade mehrere der Bedeutendsten unter ihnen haben darin eine erschreckend grosse, selbst für jene Zeit ungewöhnliche Fruchtbarkeit entwickelt.

[25] Gerdes, *Bischofswahlen*, 34, n. 9.

[26] Bresslau, *JB H II*, III, 284 ff.

[27] Anselm (*Gesta epp. Leod.*, 3, 43, *MGH, SS* VII, 216) reports that Wazo, bishop of Liège from 1042 to 1048, entered the chapel *ubi per novem menses nullo adquirendi episcopatus desiderio . . . studuit.* When after nine months of service he was appointed to Liège: *ibid.*, c. 50, 219: qui . . . asseverarent . . . ex capellanis pocius episcopum constituendum, Wazonem nunquam in curte regia desudasse ut talem promereretur honorem. Cf. Kurth, 39, nn. 3 and 4.

[28] Adaldag of Hamburg-Bremen, Bruno, Heribert and Pilgrim of Cologne, Willigis of Mainz, Egbert of Trier, Gunther of Salzburg,

While service in the chapel or chancellery was restricted to a chosen few, yet the whole episcopate was expected to join the court from time to time for *Reichstage* or smaller *Hoftage*, in connection with which were often held synods also.[29] When the court passed through the neighborhood local bishops were expected to make their appearance. Especially on the great holidays at Easter, Whitsuntide and Christmas did attendance at court swell. It was upon such occasions that the bishop was able to exercise political influence as an adviser: to get favors from the king it was desirable to present one's own claims in person.[30] Not only was attendance at court an expense that the bishop himself had to bear, but it necessitated a good deal of traveling on horseback, which no weak bishop could endure.[31] Moreover, it took a great deal of time. Indeed, the bishop of the tenth century was to a considerable degree an absentee bishop, precisely because he was away at court so much, often for years at a time.[32]

Folcmar of Utrecht, Hildebald of Worms, Egilbert of Freising, Bruno of Augsburg, Eberhard of Bamberg, Poppo of Würzburg, Liudolf of Osnabrück, Theodoric (of Meissen?); Stumpf, *Reichskanzler*, II, 8, 48, 49, 75, 76, 109. This, of course, says nothing of bishops chosen from the royal chapel.

[29] *Vita Oudal.*, c. 3, *MGH, SS* IV, 389: Postea autem curtem regis adiens, solito more servicio eius subdebatur, usque dum rex Heinricus praesentem vitam finiret. Ottoni itaque . . . eandem quam patri sedulitatem servicii et fidei firmitatem in cunctis inpertiri studebat.

[30] *Adam Bremensis*, II, 29 (Schmeidler, 90) says of archbishop Liäwizo: quippe contentus acquisitis raro curiam adiit pro acquirendis.

[31] Rimbert of Hamburg-Bremen (865-888) needed help in his old age to take care of all his duties, especially his obligations to the court: *ibid.*, I, 45 (46-47): ipse infirmitate detentus in Adalgario haberet solatium circandi episcopatum, placita adeundi et quando exigeretur, vel in expeditionem vel ad palatium cum comitatu suo profiscisci.

[32] The long absence of Adaldag of Hamburg-Bremen with Otto I in Italy from 961-965 resulted, it was reported, in his being sent for from home: *ibid.*, II, 11 (68-69): Fertur eius populus non ferens diuturnam boni pastoris absentiam nuntiis et litteris metum ingerentibus tandem effecisse ut suum gregem visere dignaretur. Franko of Worms was away a year, Othwin of Hildesheim two years, Meinwerk of Paderborn

To be sure, he could plead imperial business as an excuse for absence from local gatherings he did not wish to attend anyway,[33] but attendance at court might easily impede work that he really had to do at home.[34] Those were impressive gatherings, such as the one at Cologne in June, 965, when the whole royal family, including their Carolingian and Capetian relatives, met with the ecclesiastical and secular nobility to pay their respects to Otto I and Bruno, then at the very height of their careers (here even Balderich of Utrecht, bishop for fifty-seven years, appeared to do honor to his former pupil, Bruno); or the synod at Ingelheim in 972, when almost the whole German episcopate was present; or that at Dortmund on July 7, 1005, at which Henry II scolded his bishops;[35] or the synod of Frankfort on November 1, 1007, at which Henry finally put through his plans for the foundation of Bamberg; or the dedication of the Bamberg cathedral itself, when forty-five bishops are reported to have been present; or the dedication of the collegiate church of St. Stephen at Bamberg by Benedict VIII in 1020.

Even service in the chapel or chancellery, attendance at court, at *Reichstage, Hoftage* or synods, by no means exhausted the official duties of the bishop. From time to time we have had to refer to his services as diplomat or mediator, as *comes palatii* or *missus* in Italy, as regent, guardian, duke or count. Indeed, there was no important political mission that the bishop did not himself undertake, or in which he did not participate. At court it was always necessary to have

---

for almost a year at one time, Giseler for almost two years after becoming archbishop of Magdeburg. Cf. Sommerlad, 254, n. 3; Bertram, *Geschichte des Bistums Hildesheim*, 53; Schmidt, Giselher, 38-40.

[33] Bernward excuses himself from attending the consecration of the church at Gandersheim: astruens imperialibus iussis obstrictum . . . nec posse . . . (*Vita Bernwardi*, c. 16, *MGH, SS* IV, 765).

[34] Burchard of Worms was unable to finish a monastery, partly at least *regalis crebrositate serviminis.* (*Vita Burchardi*, c. 20, *MGH, SS* IV, 844.)

[35] Thiet., VI, 18 (Kurze, 143): magna sinodus ubi rex coepiscopis presentibus cunctis plurima questus est sanctae aecclesiae inconvenientia.

at hand bishops and clerics, whose training made them alone suitable for countless varied tasks. To accompany back to Rome the papal legates who brought the announcement of the death of Leo VIII to Otto I, send two bishops and charge them as well with the supervision of the election of the new pope. To arrange beforehand with Benedict VIII for the imperial election of 1014 at Rome, send a bishop. Let archbishop Willigis, accompanied by a bishop, conduct the German Bruno from Ravenna to Rome, to become Pope Gregory V. When it was necessary to depose and banish the anti-pope Benedict V from Italy, send him to a far-away episcopal seat such as Bremen for Adaldag to take care of. If you want to get a Greek princess as wife for your son, send to Constantinople Liutprand of Cremona, a bishop who prides himself on his knowledge of Greek. If he fails, send another mission headed by archbishop Gero of Cologne and two more bishops. When the Greek princess arrives at Benevento, have her received and conducted to Rome by Dietrich of Metz. If another Greek princess is wanted as wife for this Greek princess's son, send another Italian bishop who knows Greek along with a German bishop. If you can't take Queen Kunigunde with you to Italy, entrust her to the protecting care of the beloved Tagino, archbishop of Magdeburg.

Or again, if two monasteries quarrel over the navigation rights to a stream, put bishops on the commission of arbitration. If there is occasion to negotiate with some chapter over an episcopal election, try the persuasive eloquence of a neighboring bishop. If unruly dukes must be reconciled, whether in Lorraine, Saxony or elsewhere, appeal to the bishops. Treaties of peace and alliance could hardly be concluded at all without their aid. The frontier bishops carried on negotiations with the Slavs, whether near at hand or farther away under Boleslav's leadership. Negotiations with the kings of France were entrusted to bishops of Liège and Cambrai. When Henry II wished to settle with the great Knut the question of the Danish-German frontier, he turned for

aid to his friend archbishop Unwan of Hamburg-Bremen.[36] Bishops were usually preferred to abbots as custodians of persons in the emperor's bad graces. Duke Henry of Bavaria was sent by Otto II to the confines of the empire to be watched over for a period of years by bishop Folcmar of Utrecht. Adalbert of Magdeburg was instructed to arrest the disloyal count Gero; Thiedhard of Hildesheim was given duke Eberhard of Franconia to guard; Arnulf of Halberstadt was given custody of the unruly margrave Guncelin of Meissen. Adalbold of Utrecht kept Jaromir, duke of Bohemia, for Henry II. Giebichenstein, a fort of the archbishop of Magdeburg, did admirable service as a royal prison.

If there is one bishop whose political activities may be taken as most completely representative of all the Adaldags, Udalrichs, Giselers, Dietrichs, Bernwards, Notgers, Heriberts, Meinwerks and Burchards who trod the difficult way to and from court, undertaking the most various and manifold missions in behalf of the king, it is archbishop Willigis of Mainz, who for a period of some forty years dominated the political horizon almost like a veritable prime minister of the crown. Willigis, a Saxon, was summoned to the chancellery in 971, and from then on until his death in 1011 he gradually—with the exception of a short period of a few years—became the most prominent and influential figure among the political bishops. As chancellor he was in the constant company of Otto I and II, until after four years of service he was given the archbishopric of Mainz, the largest and greatest ecclesiastical province in Germany, if not in all Europe outside of Rome, which made him *ipso facto* archchaplain and archchancellor of the realm. While he participated prominently in the chief events of Otto II's reign in Bohemia and Bavaria—he appears constantly as a sponsor in the documents—, he had nevertheless still to share his position at court with some other bishops, such as Giseler of Merse-

[36] Stumpf, I, 5: Wahrlich auf ihren Schultern ruhte die grössere Hälfte der Reichsgeschäfte: sie waren im vollsten Sinne des Wortes die ersten Beamten der Krone.

burg, Dietrich of Metz, Adalbert of Magdeburg, not to forget Queen Theophano. As a result of his services in the preservation of the throne for Otto III, during the regency of Theophano and Adelheid his position came much nearer to supremacy. When Theophano went to Italy in 989, he was left in charge of Germany. During the period (991-994) of Adelheid's control, he, more than Notger or Giseler, more even than the chancellor, Hildebald of Worms, stands out in grants from the chancellery. From January to April and again in May and June of 993 he and Hildebald were the sole administrators of Germany. This strong position he maintained until Otto III got the imperial crown. Subsequently his influence waned before that of Gerbert, Adalbert of Prague, Bernward of Hildesheim, and Heribert of Cologne. He was unable to support enthusiastically the new imperial policies, and, as his treatment in the Gandersheim dispute and his disappearance for a while from the documents make clear, he lost favor with the young emperor. Under Henry II he recovered much of his influence, and although he finally had to back down in the matter of Gandersheim, he continued to play a significant part in such important matters as the rebellion of margrave Henry of Schweinfurt, the restoration of the diocese of Merseburg, and the royal foundation of the rich new diocese of Bamberg, which was incorporated in his archdiocese.[37] *Pontifex maximus* Widukind called the archbishop of Mainz.[38] Finally, in the great part that Willigis played in saving the throne for the young Otto III,[39] in his decisive support of Henry II's candidacy,[40] in the influence exerted by one of his predecessors, Hatto, on the election of Conrad I,[41] in the bitter struggle between Aribo of Mainz and

[37] Böhmer, *Willigis*, 1-115.

[38] Widukind, II, 1 (Kehr, 55); cf. *ibid.*, 56: summi pontificatus Magontiacae sedis.

[39] Böhmer, *op. cit.*, 26-40; Janner, I, 400-402; Nitzsch, I, 369-370; Wilmans, *JB O III*, 6-34; Richter-Kohl, 142-143. Cf. also ch. II, B.

[40] Böhmer, *op. cit.*, 105-109; Nitzsch, I, 385-386; Hirsch, I, 194-195, 201-202, 214-214 *et passim*. Cf. also ch. II.

[41] Waitz, *Verfassungsgeschichte*, VI, 147.

Pilgrim of Cologne over the election of Conrad II in 1024,[42] and in the rivalry of Mainz, Cologne and Trier during the tenth century for the prerogative of crowning the newly elected king—in all these there can be no doubt that we ought to recognize the first steps in the historical development that in later days made the archbishops of these three sees three of the seven imperial electors.

[42] Müller, *Aribo*, 37-42.

CHAPTER VII

THE BISHOP AS SOLDIER AND BUILDER

Whether or not the very character of a German bishop's job in the tenth century was inherently favorable to the development of bellicose qualities, these in any case the bishops normally possessed from the day of their birth: they were born out of a fighting aristocracy. In the attempt to make vivid and concrete their conflict with the secular feudality it has already been necessary to point to their activities as *briseurs de bastilles*,[1] and even to refer to their military services on behalf of the crown. At this point it seems desirable to consider a little more specifically their participation in what may be called public rather than private warfare. During this period German bishops acquired a reputation for pugnacity that was maintained for centuries[2]—not at all strange in an age that had likewise its belligerent popes. The successors of St. Peter mounted the walls of Rome to hearten the Romans fighting off the attack of an imperial army,[3] or as fully armed warriors went forth to meet the foe face to face.[4] The incongruity between the bishop as the professed leader of his flock in the Christian way of life and the bishop as warrior had long been a subject of royal legislation.[5] But cold reality and stern necessity nullified any such legislation.

[1] Kurth, 27.

[2] Cf. the deservedly often quoted remark of Richard of Cornwall to his nephew (1257), (*Ex Annal. Burton.*, 1257, Mai. 9, *MGH, SS* XXVII, 480): Ecce, quam animosos et bellicosos archiepiscopos et episcopos habemus in Alemannia, non multum vobis inutile reputantes, si tales in Anglia crearentur. Cf. Fisher, 89 ff.; Thompson, *Feudal Germany*, 302, n. 1.

[3] *Cont. Reg.*, 964 (Kurze, 174): Sed predictus Benedictus (V), falso nomine apostolicus, diutius ut imperatori resisterent Romanos animavit, ipseque imperatori suisque fidelibus excommumicationem comminans muros urbis ascendit et elatiori se fastu quam apostolicum decuerat continuit.

[4] Liudprand, *Hist. Otto.*, c. 11, *MGH, SS* III, 343, of John XII: exercitui domni imperatoris . . . cui ante quinque dies ense accinctus, clipeo galea et lorica indutus, occurrit.

[5] Sugenheim, 317 ff.

From the point of view of the state, to exempt the clergy from personal participation in war was, as Charles the Great discovered, to threaten its military power, since immediately there was a great rush into the clergy.[6] It corresponded far more to actual needs to make sure, if a bishop pleaded illness as an excuse for not joining personally in a campaign, that he was really ill.[7] The bishop was of necessity armed and of necessity fought. In the midst of such a revolutionary epoch as the ninth century there was little to protect him but himself. He had to build up his military strength at a time when without it he would have counted for almost nothing. In view of all that has been said of the relations of the Ottonians and their bishops in the tenth century it will seem an easy and inevitable step from fighting for themselves to fighting for the king.

A good deal of the defense against the Vikings had fallen inevitably upon the shoulders of the bishops and their troops.[8]

---

[6] Charles legislates in a capitulary of 805, c. 15, *MGH*, Capit. I, 125: De liberis hominibus qui ad servitium Dei se tradere volent, ut prius hoc non fatiant quam a nobis licentiam postulent. Hoc ideo, quia audivimus aliquos ex illis non tam causa devotionis quam exercitu seu alia funccione regali fugiendo, . . . et hos ideo fieri prohibemus. Charles himself was forced to mitigate the heavy burden of military service on the freeman.

[7] Ludwig, II, *Const. de Exped. Benevent.*, 866, c. 4, *MGH*, Capit. II 96: Si quoque episcopus absque manifesta infirmitate remanserit; c. 5: constituimus, ut episcopus . . . si in infirmitate incerta detentus fuerit . . . per suum missum quem meliorem habet . . . hoc sub sacramentum affirment, quod pro nulla occasione remansissent, nisi quod pro certissima infirmitate hoc agere non potuissent.

[8] Thompson, *Feudal Germany*, 297. The bishops of Minden and Hildesheim lost their lives in 880 (Hauck, III, 7); likewise the bishop of Metz in 882 and the archbishop of Mainz in 891 (Aubin-Levison, 64). Arn of Würzburg was active against both Vikings and Wends, and lost his life on a Bohemian campaign while saying mass on the field of battle (Hirsch, *JB H II*, 49, n. 1). Archbishop Liutbert of Mainz and bishop Franko of Liège were notable fighters against the Vikings. Rudolf of Würzburg lost his life in battle (Sommerlad, II, 212). Hauck (1890), II, 653, states that between 886 and 908 ten German bishops fell in battle.

During the first half of the tenth century it was against the Hungarians that the bishop had to defend his city. The defeat of the Bavarian army by the Hungarians in the Ostmark in July 907 cost the lives of archbishop Theotmar of Salzburg and two of his suffragans, Uto of Freising and Zacharias of Seben.[9] Michael of Regensburg acquired a considerable reputation for his heroic exploits against the Hungarians. In an encounter of 949 he lost an ear, and from other wounds lay as if dead upon the field of battle. In this condition he was attacked by a wounded Hungarian, whom he managed to kill. After a difficult journey home he was received with acclaim for the good soldier that he was, nor, we are assured, did the fact that he had only one ear bring him anything except honor.[10] In April of 953 Fulbert of Cambrai had to defend his city against the Hungarians. The fortifications of the city were strengthened and the inhabitants of the countryside brought within the walls, and although the suburb before the walls was burnt, the enemy were unable to break into the city. Fulbert between prayers ran up and down the wall instilling courage into his men and promising victory.[11] Udalrich of Augsburg supervised the defense of his city against the assault of the Hungarians just before the final fight at the Lechfeld. The city was poorly fortified with

[9] Widmann, I, 146 f.; Janner, I, 276.

[10] Thiet., II, 27 (Kurze, 36): Episcopus autem, abscisa suimet auricula et caeteris sauciatus membris, cum interfectis quasi mortuus latuit. Iuxta quem inimicus homo iacens et hunc vivere solum ab insidiantium laqueis tunc securus cernens hastam sumpsit et necare eundem conatus est. Tunc iste . . . post longum mutui agonis luctamen victor hostem prostravit et inter multas itineris asperitates incolomis notos pervenit ad fines. Inde gaudium gregi suo [exoritur] . . . Excipitur ab omnibus miles bonus in clero . . . fuit eiusdem mutilatio non ad dedecus sed ad honorem magis. Arnold of St. Emm., I, c. 17, *MGH, SS* IV, 554: Ungri meam abscidentes auriculam gladiis ac spiculis inter ceteros me straverant ac adaequaverant glebis.

[11] *Gesta epp. Camerac.*, c. 75, *MGH, SS* VII, 428: merens episcopus modo Dei genitricem precibus exagitat . . . modo vero per propugnacula cursitans suos viritim comfortat et instruit, viriliter dimicent, invincibiles pugnent; Dei enim esse contra alienigenas pugnam, illi futuram victoriam.

low walls without towers. His tactics were to keep his men within the city, risking no losses by sortie. During the siege he sat upon his horse, unarmed, clad in a stole, oblivious of the rain of spears and stones about him. When evening brought respite, he spent the whole night strengthening the fortifications and praying.[12] The morning found him ready for another day's siege, but the approach of Otto I's troops drew the enemy off. Udalrich apparently was not at the Lechfeld. It was only after the battle was over that he went to the field to find the bodies of his brother and his nephew and bring them back to Augsburg.[13]

For such work the bishops needed soldiers and plenty of them. A soldiery could be built up only on the basis of grants of land, which in itself goes far to account for the efforts of every bishop to increase and round out his holdings. His secular position in turn depended in large degree upon his military, which again accounts for a large measure of the generosity of the Ottonians to the episcopate. The crown, since it depended upon the bishops for large support in all its military activities, was accordingly contributing to its own strength when it enabled the bishops to increase the number of their vassals by granting them more land.[14] Without fur-

---

[12] *Vita Oudal.*, c. 12, *MGH, SS* IV, 401: Hora vero belli episcopus super caballum suum sedens, stola indutus, non clipeo aut lorica aut galea munitus, iaculis et lapidibus undique circa eum discurrentibus intactus et inlaesus subsistebat. Bello vero finito regrediens circuivit civitatem, et domos belli in circuitu civitatis congruenter ponere, et in tota nocte eas aedificare, et vallos, quantum tempus suppetebat, renovare praecepit.

[13] Cf. ch. VI, p. 190.

[14] References to episcopal armies are numerous and varied. Thietmar refers simply to *milites* or *socii*: IV, 2 (Kurze, 65): milites sancti Martini; IX, 22 (Kurze, 232): meis . . . sociis; VII, 57 (Kurze, 190): militibus suis. *Gesta epp. Camerac.*, I, 93, *MGH, SS* VII, 438: Copiosi exercitus; I, 99, 441: a suis vassallis; I, 105, 444: episcopalium militum; III, 1, 465: vassallisque . . . sibi sacramento constrictis. *Vita Bernwardi*, 32, *MGH, SS* IV, 772: de vassatico archiepiscopi; 31, 772: homines archiepiscopi. *Vita Oudal.*, c. 28, *MGH, SS* IV, 418: quidam milites beneficia aecclesiastica . . . possidebant. *Anon. Haser.*, c. 8,

ther study it seems to me quite as difficult to determine the specific legal or constitutional ground for the bishops' military service as for any of the other *servitia* that they rendered to the crown.[15] There can be no doubt that it was rendered.

Within and without the kingdom bishops were to be found taking part in all important military undertakings, not simply by ministering to the religious needs of the army or calling upon God to bring victory, but by sending their troops, which they often brought in person and often enough led into battle. When Otto II besieged the sons of Regnier au Long-Col of Hainault in 974, bishop Tetdo of Cambrai was present, and we may assume with troops.[16] Four years later, on the march to Paris against Lothar, Dietrich of Metz assisted duke Charles of Lower Lorraine in the occupation of Laon.[17] When the heights of Montmartre were reached, the clergy celebrated the victory with the singing of such an Alleluia as had never been heard before, a flood of German voices that struck the Parisians with amazement.[18] On the return march bishop

---

MGH, SS VII, 256: Tunc primum Aureatensis episcopatus milites habere coepit. . . . Nam hodieque ex tanta Aureatensis militiae multitudine tribus tantum seu quatuor exceptis ceteri omnes beneficiati sunt ex huius abbatiae bonis. Anselm, *Gesta epp. Leod.*, 29, *MGH, SS* VII, 206, of Notger of Liège: praedia aecclesiae in tres aequas porciones divisit, quarum . . . tertiam his qui miliciam exercerent concessit. Dümmler, 530, n. 3, cites a complaint of the archbishop of Trier: cum ipsius episcopii maxima pars militibus essent in beneficium distributa, ita ut nulli locorum propria hereditate prodesse possem.

[15] Nitzsch, I, 358, states that military service, at least for Italy, had become *eine rein lehnrechtliche Verpflichtung*. I know of no positive evidence to support this. Of the summons of 981 certainly too little is known to warrant the conclusion that it presumes a feudal contract, a formal relationship of vassal and lord.

[16] *Gesta epp. Camerac.*, I, 95, *MGH, SS* VII, 440: Ad hanc etiam obsidionem Tietdo episcopus interfuit.

[17] Uhlirz, *JB O II*, 113.

[18] *Gesta epp. Camerac.*, I, 97, *MGH, SS* VII, 441: ad pompandam victoriae suae gloriam Hugoni qui Parisius residebat per legationem denuncians, quod in tantam sublimitatem Alleluia faceret ei decantari

Wolfgang of Regensburg distinguished himself by charging into the flooded Aisne at the head of a rear detachment attacked by the enemy and hesitating to cross the swollen stream.[19] Bernward of Hildesheim was called into consultation by Otto III at Rome as to how to avoid disaster in a siege of Tivoli in January 1001. Bernward suggested a more artful method of siege, which was successful, and along with Sylvester II was the chief negotiator of the terms of surrender.[20] In the revolt of the Romans against Otto III during the same year it was Bernward who headed the imperial troops, bearing the sacred spear containing some nails from the Cross, which Henry I had received from Rudolph of Burgundy.[21] In Henry II's campaign aginst Henry of Schweinfurt in 1003, bishop Henry of Würzburg and the abbot of Fulda were commissioned to burn Schweinfurt.[22] In 1007 Bernward brought a large force to Henry II for his campaign against Baldwin of Flanders.[23] Gerard of Cambrai

---

in quanta non audierit, accitis quam pluribus clericis, Alleluia te martirum in loco qui dicitur Mons Martirum in tantum elatis vocibus decantari precepit, ut attonitis auribus ipse Hugo et omnis Parisiorum plebs miraretur.

[19] Othloni, *Vita S. Wolfkangi*, c. 32, *MGH, SS* IV, 539: Adhuc vero illis prae timore cunctantibus et Francis a tergo acriter impugnantibus, ille primus sui comitatus per nomen Domini, quod semper in ore sonuit, fluvium transiens sequentes prosperavit.

[20] *Vita Bernwardi*, c. 23, *MGH, SS* IV, 769: Sed nunc praecipite, artiori obsidione urbam vallari . . . domnus Bernwardus et apostolicus praefatam urbem adeunt. . . . Cives . . . servos dei . . . excipiunt . . . nec prius desistunt quam omnes pacatos imperatoris ditioni . . . subdunt.

[21] *Ibid.*, c. 24, 770: Signifer ipse cum sancta hasta in prima fronte aciei egredi parat. Sequenti autem mane . . . ipso antistite cum sancta hasta in principio terribiliter fulminante.

[22] Thiet., V, 38 (Kurze, 128): Misit tunc Heinricum . . . episcopum et Erkanbaldum . . . abbatem ut Suinvordi castellum incenderent atque diruerent.

[23] *Vita Bernwardi*, c. 41, *MGH, SS* IV, 776: cum immensa militum manu secutus vigilantissimo obsequio ad gratiam militabat.

was present at the siege of Metz in August 1012.[24] Heribert of Cologne and count Gerard of Alsace were entrusted with the destruction of a fort of Berthold of Walbeck.[25] In 1022 Henry II divided the German army in Italy into three sections, of which he gave command of one to the German patriarch of Aquileia and of a second to archbishop Pilgrim of Cologne. Pilgrim led his troops against the abbot of Monte Cassino, whom he forced to flee, and the abbot's brother, Pandulf of Capua, who was arrested. After a forty day siege of Salerno, and after the prince of Naples had made his submission, Pilgrim, well content with his military success, joined the army of Henry II at Troja.[26] On the eastern frontier the military aid of the bishops was indispensable. Indeed, Thietmar tells us that Magdeburg was founded for the defense of the common fatherland.[27] In his chronicle the archbishops of Magdeburg, Giseler, Tagino, Walter and Gero, all share in the conduct of the succession of campaigns eastward, along with other Saxon bishops, including Thietmar himself. He is usually careful, too, in enumerations of armies led against the Slavs, to mention first the episcopal contingents.[28]

This sort of thing could be kept up almost indefinitely, but surely we have adduced incidents enough to make it plain that neither the Ottonians nor their bishops felt any incongruity in the military obligations of the episcopate. The bishops may well have found it inconvenient at times to take the

[24] *Gesta epp. Camerac.*, III, 3, *MGH, SS* VII, 467: dum . . . Gerardus ad obsidionem Mettensium civitatis aliquamdiu cum inperatore moraretur.

[25] Hirsch, *JB H II*, III, 69.

[26] Bresslau, *JB H II*, III, 198-204; Richter-Kohl, 242-243.

[27] Thietmar, II, 20 (Kurze, 30): ob defensionem . . . communis patriae.

[28] Michael of Regensburg was an active participant in all of Otto I's Bohemian affairs (Janner, I, 325-331). Gottschalk of Freising was on Henry II's campaign of 1004 to Prague (Thietmar, VI, 13; Kurze, 141-142). In 992 a deacon of Verden and a priest of Bremen were killed acting as banner-bearers (Hirsch, *JB H II*, I, 259). Giseler of Magdeburg, assisted by Hildeward of Halberstadt, won a victory in the Belxemgau in the campaign of 983 against the revolting Slavs: Thiet-

field, or they may have been personally out of sympathy with the purpose of the levy. But we know of very few cases where they even tried to beg off, and in no case was the proffered excuse accepted.[29] Among the numerous Ottonian

---

mar, III, 18 (Kurze, 59): Conveniunt episcopi Gisillerus et Hilliwardus . . . hostesque obvios fiducialiter inrumpentes, paucis in unum collem effugientibus, prosternunt. In 990 Giseler undertook mediation between Boleslav of Bohemia and Miesko of Poland, and barely escaped a small detachment of Liutizi on the way home: *ibid.*, IV, 11 (Kurze, 70): Qui (Giseler and counts) [vix cum IIII] proficiscentes [legionibus] . . . Deo gratias ad Magadaburg incolumes pervenerunt. Arneburg was given to Giseler to hold for a short while in 997, and only for a short time did he choose to hold it; he barely escaped from a ruse of the Slavs: *ibid.*, IV, 38 (Kurze, 85): Imperator ob defensionem patriae Harnaburg civitatem . . . IIII ebdomades ad tuendum huic commisit . . . archiantistes, qui curru venit, equo fugit alato. Cf. Hirsch, *JB H II*, I, 257. Bishop Ramward of Minden led troops into battle in 997 bearing a cross: Thiet., IV, 29 (Kurze, 81): In illo certamine Ramwardus . . . fuit, qui socios arrepta in manibus cruce sua sequentibus signiferis precessit et ad haec facienda potenter consolidavit. Tagino of Magdeburg took part in a campaign against Boleslav in 1005, which cost Arnulf of Halberstadt three good soldiers, and headed the peace delegation (Thiet., VI, 26-27; Kurze, 149 f.). He headed the disastrous campaign against Boleslav in 1007, in which Thietmar also shared: *ibid.*, 33 (153): Horum primicerius fuit Tagino archiepiscopus; et haec omnia prius sciens, non bene providebat. Fui hic equidem cum illo. When Tagino fell ill on the campaign of 1010 it was Arnulf of Halberstadt and Meinwerk of Paderborn who continued the campaign: *ibid.*, 57 (Kurze, 167): quod Arnulfus . . . et Meinwercus episcopi . . . vastarent. Sicque factum est. Walter, Tagino's successor, read his last mass on the field of battle (Richter-Kohl, 205). On the campaign of 1015 Saxon bishops were with duke Bernhard: Thiet., VIII, 17 (Kurze, 203): Bernhardus . . . cum suis fautoribus, episcopis et comitibus . . . Bolizlavum peciit. Gero of Magdeburg was on the campaign and barely escaped from a Polish ambush: *ibid.*, 21 (205): Gero archiepiscopus et Burchardus comes vulneratus vix evadentes cesari haec referebat. Bishop Eid of Meissen, one of the bishops present, was sent to Boleslav to secure permission to bury the German dead (*ibid.*, VIII, 22). Arnulf of Halberstadt was one of the negotiators of the peace of Bautzen in 1018 (*ibid.*, IX, 1, 239).

[29] In 1018 Henry II refused to exempt Balderich of Liège from personal service in a campaign, although the old bishop was so ill that he died on the march (see ch. III, p. 141). When Heribert of Cologne,

grants of all sorts of privileges to the bishops I know of only one grant of immunity from military service, and that is a confirmation of immunity from an earlier time, when it was more freely granted, and is practically nullified by the repetition of the proviso that the immunity shall not hold when the welfare of the kingdom shall require the military services of the bishop's vassals.[30] In 981 Otto II called upon nineteen German bishops to send to him in Italy 1072 soldiers.[31] Twelve bishops were instructed merely to send their troops, seven to bring them in person. Of the total number demanded of Germany in this summons, the bishops were to furnish approximately fifty per cent, the rest being divided about equally between monasteries and seculars. The omissions conspicuous in the roster have been generally taken to mean that we have here a call for reinforcements, after the major part of the army had already gone to Italy with Otto II. It is rather difficult, therefore, to argue as to the relative proportion of episcopal to other troops summoned to Italy for this campaign, not to mention other campaigns. German historians, however, have ventured the opinion that from the bishops and abbots together came generally a larger proportion of troops than from other sources, that the Otto-

although he obeyed the summons to send his troops to share in Henry II's operations against Count Otto of Hammerstein (see ch. II, p. 55), alleged a severe fever as an excuse for not coming himself, Henry, suspicious of the archbishop because of the bad relations that had existed between them ever since Heribert's opposition to his election, angrily retorted that in that case he would have to pay him a sick call. As a matter of fact, he was very well received by Heribert, and the incident ended in his apologizing and in their reconciliation. Cf. Bresslau, *JB H II*, III, 176-178.

[30] *MGH, DD* I, 425, No. 310, for Worms: nec ab hominibus ipsius ecclesiae hostilis expeditio requiratur, nisi, quando necessitas utilitati regum fuerit, simul cum suo episcopo pergant.

[31] The document is printed in Jaffé, *BRG*, V, 471, Uhlirz, *JB O II, Excurs VIII*, 247-248, and *MGH, Const.*, I, 632. Thompson, *Feudal Germany*, 40, n. 1, gives an analysis of it; according to the document as printed, however, Albuin of Seben-Brixen was to bring twenty, not fifty, men, and Reginald of Eichstätt fifty (in Uhlirz, 40), not twenty.

nian armies were therefore largely ecclesiastical.[32] Certainly in the summons of 981 the archbishops of Cologne and Mainz and the bishops of Strassburg and Augsburg were asked each to supply thirty more armed men than any duke. Similarly in 1001 Otto III and Sylvester II summoned all the German bishops to Italy for military service.[33] As with the summons of 981, we have no way of knowing to what extent this was actually obeyed. It is hard to believe that any very large number of German bishops appeared in Italy in the course of that year. Willigis of Mainz did not go but did send troops.[34] Heribert of Cologne arrived with troops, but too late to be able to do much more than fight his way back to Germany with the dead body of Otto III. We have also knowledge of what must have been a partial summons for the episcopal troops of Lower Lorraine against Count Dietrich of Holland.[35] Along with the duty of furnishing the larger contingents of heavy-armed cavalry went also the necessity of supplying supporting bodies of light-armed cavalry, to say nothing of the entire commissariat.[36] If now we try to estimate the enormous expense that all this entailed, we shall perhaps gain a juster appreciation of the character of the support that the German bishops gave their kings.

Not even by furnishing and maintaining his contingents in the king's service could the bishop discharge in full his military obligations. He was also military engineer and

[32] Gerdes, I, 479 ff.; Nitzsch, I, 358; Ficker, *op. cit.*, 405; Thompson, *Feudal Germany*, 39-40. Cf. Uhlirz, *JB O II*, 250 ff.; Hartmann, IV, 74; Sommerlad, II, 250 ff.

[33] *Vita Bernwardi*, c. 30, *MGH, SS* IV, 722: iubent universos Theotiscos episcopos circa natale Domini ad illorum praesentiam festinare, non solum ad synodum, sed cum suo vassatico ita instructos ut ad bellum quocumque imperator praecipiat possent procedere.

[34] Böhmer, *Willigis*, 102-105. *Vita Burchardi*, c. 8, *MGH, SS* IV, 846: (*Burchard*) iussu imperatoris cum apparatu magno et milites Moguntinenses necnon et abbas Fuldensis atque episcopus Wirtzburgensis cum non modica multitudine in Italiam profecti sunt.

[35] *Gesta epp. Camerac.*, III, 19, *MGH, SS* VII, 471. See *supra*, chap. III, p. 140.

[36] Meister, 134; Gerdes, *Geschichte*, I, 490 f.

architect, occupied with the active building of forts, walls and supplementary fortifications for his own city and its immediate neighborhood. We have already had occasion to point to several instances of the building of episcopal forts in cities to offset secular forts, and of the manning or new construction of fortifications on the frontier by the bishops. Military as well as political and economic power was fast becoming localized. The obligation to strengthen the defenses of his city and territory rested entirely upon the bishop's own shoulders.[37] Bernward of Hildesheim spent the whole summer of 1001, suffering the while from stomach trouble, working on the walls that he had begun. When they were done and equipped with towers, whether for beauty or for strength, we are told, there was nothing like them in all Saxony.[38] "Like a strong giant happy to meet his foe," he also built two forts to protect his diocese from attack by the Danes.[39] His successor, Godehard, a notably capable and enthusiastic builder,[40] who was not loath to lend a hand him-

[37] E. Lauer, *The Significance of the Town Wall in the Development of the Medieval City*, Ms., University of Chicago Library, 1929, 46-93; Kurth, *Notger*, 132-134; Böhmer, *Willigis*, 118, n. 9; Sommerlad, II. 234-235.

[38] *Vita Bernwardi*, c. 27, *MGH, SS* IV, 771: Totum autem aestivum tempus in exstructione murorum civitatis . . . institit, interdum etiam gravi stomachi molestia laboravit; c. 8, 761-762: locum nostrum murorum ambitu vallare . . . aggressus, dispositis per gyrum turribus, tanta prudentia opus inchoavit, ut decore simul ac munimine, velut hodie patet, simile nil in omni Saxonia invenias.

[39] *Ibid.*, c. 7, *MGH, SS* IV, 761: Divino itaque instinctu in extremo fere sui episcopatus . . . munitiunculam admodum munitam extruxit, in qua copiis militum dispositis barbarorum impetum repulit . . . barbarico tumultu in illis locis eliminato, acrius in circumsita loca debachati sunt. Unde vigilantissimus . . . pastor . . . adversariis aecclesiae, exultans ad currendam viam ut fortis gygas, se opposuit, et in rure Wirinholt nuncupato, ubi tutissima illorum statio fuerat, . . . praesidium munitissimum instituit fossisque aquarumque meatibus per rivum influentibus tutissimum reddidit, copias quoque militum victu et armis caeterisque necessariis instructas habundantissime collocavit.

[40] *Vita Godehardi prior*, v. 13, *MGH, SS* XI, 178: Quantum autem ille . . . in edificiis, vetera scilicet, inconvenientiaque destruendo et alia nova et etiam convenientiora reedificando, laboraverit.

self,[41] built two more such forts.[42] Bishop Liäwizo of Hamburg-Bremen, while he wielded the sword of anathema against the Danes,[43] likewise began to fortify Bremen.[44] Later bishop Unwan is reported to have strengthened these fortifications, fearing the depredations of duke Bernhard of Saxony.[45] Bishop Meinwerk gave walls to Paderborn, and at Magdeburg bishop Gero completed the walls begun by Otto I.[46] At Cambrai, for defense against the Normans Dodilo greatly enlarged the fortifications, which were further strengthened in anticipation of Hungarian attack by Fulbert; still later a larger wall to include the whole town was built by Gerard.[47] Farther south, where the greatest danger was the Hungari-

[41] *Ibid.*, c. 12, 177: Nec mora, silvis vepribusque erutis et exustis eundem montem undique adequavit et, quod incredibile memoratu est, manibus tam suis quam et operariorum ligna lapides terramque comportando mirabiliter . . . ampliavit.

[42] *Ibid.*, c. 37, 194: Duo quoque castella construxit unum quidem . . . in quodam palude . . . aliud vero . . . in speciosi cuiusdam montis cacumine.

[43] *Adam Bremensis*, II, 33 (Schmeidler, 94): Nam et ipse Libentius, ut sermo est, pyratas qui episcopatum vastabant anathematis gladio dampnavit.

[44] *Ibid.*: ipsa Brema vallo muniri sepit firmissimo. Schmeidler, 94, n. 1, says that the walls included only the *Domimmunität*.

[45] *Ibid.*, II, 48 (108): Ipse tempore ferunt aggerem Bremensis oppidi firmatum contra insidias et impetus inimicorum regis, precipue . . . dux Bernardus.

[46] *Vita Meinwerci*, c. 159, *MGH, SS* XI, 140. *Ann. Mag.*, c. 22 (1023), *MGH, SS* XVI, 168: Muros nichilominus urbis, quos Otto pius imperator inperfectos reliquit, hic consummavit: *Gesta archiepp. Mag.*, c. 18, *MGH, SS* XIV, 397.

[47] *Gesta epp. Camerac.*, I, 65, *MGH, SS* VII, 424: Hic (Dodilo) autem exstructis muris menia urbis in tantum ampliavit, ut monasterium . . . quod extra erat intra murorum ambitum cohiberet; *ibid.*, I, 75, 428: Fulbertus episcopus impigre imminentem ruinam providens urbem attentiore cura muniri exercuit; *ibid.*, *Contin.*, 5, 499: totam in circuitu civitatem, vallo ligneo prius compositam, ipse episcopus (Gerard) munivit muro lapideo fortius, fossatis relevatis et plurimis inter murum coedificatis turribus.

ans, the fort of Stauf at Regensburg, for example,[48] was presumably built as a defense against them.[49]

A great deal of the building activity of the bishops was more than merely military. In connection with the construction or enlargement or restoration of fortifications, often even quite independently of any military purpose, many of them were veritable rebuilders of their cities. They were supervising architects, contractors and superintendents of construction, often all in one, to say nothing of financing the operations. Again, much of their work was rebuilding and restoration, which naturally offered easy opportunity for expansion of all sorts. The contemporary historians who record the deeds of the bishops that set about restoring their cities, devastated by fire or siege or sack, never fail to put their adjectives in the comparative degree: everything is bigger, higher, better, even when it is not wholly new. Moreover, the bishop was zealous to complete in his own lifetime all he had undertaken; when Willigis of Mainz saw the cathedral that he had been building for thirty years burn on the day of its dedication, he set to work immediately to build a cathedral.[50]

Even without venturing to touch further upon the vast subject of the building of cathedrals, churches, monasteries, we have space to offer only a few of innumerable examples of construction or restoration rather civil than military—oftentimes not military at all—in character. In the north Balderich of Utrecht, after a Viking siege, built walls, gates and a bridge.[51] Against a later siege in 1007 bishop Ansfrid's

[48] Janner, I, 294.

[49] These tenth century fortifications were, of course, very seldom of stone, but generally wooden palisades with towers, surrounded by moats; cf. Lauer, 86.

[50] In addition to sixteen new churches Willigis, like Henry of Würzburg, built bridges: Böhmer, *Willigis*, 149-151.

[51] Pontem trans fossatum urbemque cum portis et murum cum propugnaculis (quoted by Waitz, *JB H I*, 94, n. 3). Cf. Hirsch, *JB H II*, I, 343-344. Wattenbach (*Geschichtsquellen*, I, 350):

> Trajectina feris urbs Danis versa latebat,
> Baldricus priscum reddidit ipse decus.

defense was so successful that only the docks had to be rebuilt.[52] Notger of Liège greatly enlarged the fortifications and also deepened a branch of the Meuse that separated the town proper from a suburb. The dredged channel, besides affording better protection to both sides, was not improbably intended to serve also as highway for transportation.[53] Indeed, there was hardly anything important in Liège that Notger did not build or complete; as his biographer says, "he seems rather to have built the city than to have lived in it." [54] Hamburg, after it had been burned by the Obodrites, was raised from its ashes by bishop Unwan.[55] Heimo of Ver-

[52] Hirsch, *JB H II*, II, 16-17.

[53] Anselmi, *Gesta epp. Leod.*, c. 25, *MGH, SS* VII, 203: urbem muris dilatavit et reparavit. *Vita Notgeri*, c. 3 (Kurth, II, 11): Claustrum exterius . . . inciso colle Publici Montis triplici vallo et muro cum propugnaculis et turribus sublimibus communivit, et eandem muri et turrium munitionem circa ambitum civitatis . . . sicut adhuc hodie videtur perduxit; c. 5 (Kurth, II, 12): Mosam fluvium qui extra civitatem fluebat civitati introduxit . . . per medium civitatis in communes usus fluere fecit. Cf. Kurth, 141-144, and the informing map, II, 24. Notger also rebuilt a fort of the monastery of Lobbes (c. 6, [Kurth, II, 12]: in defentionem marchie episcopalis), fortified the church and monastery of Fosse (*ibid.*: muro eidem ecclesie circumducto et turribus in defensionem muri constitutis), and probably fortified Malines (Kurth, 188).

[54] *Vita Notgeri*, c. 5 (Kurth, II, 12): Vix aliquid magni aut preclari operis est in civitate nostra quod ipse non fecerit aut perfecerit, ut magis fecisse civitatem quam coluisse videatur. Cf. Kurth, 130 ff.

[55] *Adam Bremensis*, II, 49 (Schmeidler, 109): Ad cuius restaurationem . . . metropolitanus asseritur post cladem Sclavonicam civitatem et ecclesiam fecisse novam; II, 60, 119: Unwanus . . . metropolem Hammaburg renovavit.

Lauer, 74, speaks of Balderic of Liège (955-959) and Hermann of Bremen (1032-1035) as notable city restorers. As his authority for Balderich he cites *Vita Balderici*, referring to *MGH, SS* VII, 203 (25), which happens to be Anselmi, *Gesta epp. Leod.*, and concerns Notger, not Balderich. He cites also p. 222 (54); chapter 54 happens to be on p. 221 and certainly has nothing to do with Balderich. The reference to Balderich in ch. 23, 24, p. 201, would certainly not lead one to believe that he was a restorer of his city.

As his authority for Hermann he cites *Adam Bremensis, MGH, SS* VII, c. 31, 317, which concerns Liäwizo; 322, which concerns Unwan;

dun would have extended the walls of his city to include the monastery of St. Vanne, had he not been blocked by the stubbornness of its abbot.[56] Gerard of Cambrai, finding that a building that he was especially anxious to get done was being held up by the necessity of fetching stone for the columns from a quarry thirty miles away, went looking himself for stone nearer at hand and unearthed two good quarries close by.[57] Three bishops, Gero of Magdeburg, Arnulf of Halberstadt and Thietmar of Merseburg, were sent to assist in rebuilding that part of Meissen that was burned by the Poles in September, 1015.[58]

The condition of Worms at the beginning of Burchard's episcopate his biographer paints in the blackest colors: it had become a very den of thieves and wolves, and the inhabitants had been obliged to move out of the city and protect themselves as best they could.[59] Granted some exaggeration to heighten the glory of Burchard's restoration, the death in rapid succession of four bishops and their absence from the diocese on imperial business during their short incumbency had undoubtedly contributed to a situation calling for prompt

---

and 330, which, while it does concern Herman, certainly does not give enough information to justify calling him a restorer of his city. He had scarcely begun the walls before he died (vixque iactis fundamentis cum opere vitam finivit).

[56] Hauck, III, 480.

[57] *Gesta epp. Camerac.*, III, 49, *MGH, SS* VII, 483: Nec solum ibi (Lesdain) sed etiam propius, in villa videlicet Nigella (Nogelles), fodiens, aliud genus bonorum lapidum se reperisse laetatur.

[58] Thiet., VIII, 23 (Kurze, 206): Imperator . . . suburbium non longe post redintegrare precepit. Ad huius operis supplementum et custodiam Gero . . . et Arnulfus . . . conveniebant. . . . Hiis omnibus ego longe inferior interfui. In XIIII diebus incepta ad unguem . . . perducentes abivimus.

[59] *Vita Burchardi*, c. 6, *MGH, SS* IV, 835: Nam non usui hominum sed ferarum et maxime luporum latibulis aptissima erat. Thirty-five serfs of the bishopric were killed in one year in disputes over business matters and there were incessant feuds between the Worms and Lorsch serfs: Boos, I, 246-249.

relief.[60] Robert of Metz rebuilt walls as well as monasteries.[61] Even Bruno of Cologne somehow found time to build, rebuild, restore.[62] In the south Udalrich of Augsburg, who found his city in poor condition from a previous fire and his supply of labor greatly reduced by the depredations of the Hungarians, nevertheless managed to rebuild and heighten the old, low, rotten, wooden walls.[63] A second restoration was necessary after the siege of 953.[64] Udalrich disliked smallness and cheapness in his building, whether the work was going to show or not.[65] His advice on architectural matters was sought by other builders.[66] Beginning with Heribert, the bishops of Eichstätt, who had early been granted the right to fortify their holdings,[67] developed what

[60] *Vita Burchardi*, c. 6, *MGH, SS* IV, 835: vallo firmissimo circumdedit civitatem. Undique reaedificavit murum. Lauer, 75, states that it was the "old Roman wall" that was being repaired. Cf. Boos, I, 247, and Lauer, 77-78, for a Worms *Mauerbauordnung*, which may be Burchard's work.

[61] *Gesta epp. Mett.*, c. 43, *MGH, SS* X, 541: reformator coenobiorum et murorum urbis.

[62] *Vita Brunonis*, c. 33 (Pertz, 32): quaedam a fundamentis erexit, quaedam prius fundata nobiliter auxit, alia olim diruta reparavit.

Lauer, 65 and 88, n. 1, includes Cologne, Mainz, Speyer, Strassburg, and Basel among the Rhine cities whose walls were rebuilt or repaired at this time. Kurth adds Constance (134, n. 8).

[63] *Vita Oudal.*, c. 3, *MGH, SS* IV, 390: civitatem . . . ineptis valliculis et lignis putridis circumdatam; c. 13, 403: muros ex maxima parte ab ignibus depositos . . . reaedificare fecit, et priori altitudini mensuram unius cubiti superposuit.

[64] *Ibid.*, c. 1, 387: Adquisitis . . . architectis et multitudine congregata familiae coepit . . . diruta restaurare . . . magnoque animi fervore studens ut coepta perficere non desisteret.

[65] *Ibid.*: parvitatem lucidae criptaeque vilitatem sibi nimis displicere conquestus, seque professus est competentius decentiusque . . . positurum. Cf. c. 13, 402-403.

[66] *Ibid.*, c. 25, 410: venerunt nepotes sui . . . et rogaverunt illum ut pergeret . . . illis monstraret qualiter aecclesiam ibi sitam . . . ordinare et quantae magnitudinis eam facere debuissent.

[67] *Mon. Boica*, XXXXI, I, 178, No. XC: ut ei liceret . . . in suo episcopatu aliquas munitiones contra paganorum incursus moliri . . . licentiam concedimus . . . urbemque construere. Waitz, *JB H I*, 93, n. 2.

the chronicler calls an hereditary passion for building, like the bishops of Würzburg, to whom it was somehow natural to tear down and rebuild.[68] Heribert must make walls higher, churches bigger, everything better.[69] The humble days of the good old bishops were gone, and the ambitions of Heribert and his successors brought great hardship upon the episcopal serfs.[70]

[68] *Anon. Haser.*, c. 29, *MGH, SS* VII, 261: Hoc opus, hoc studium cum his episcopis venit, quibus erat et est hereditarium; *ibid.*, Wirzeburgensibus . . . quodam modo naturale est destruere et aedificare, quadrata rotundis mutare.

[69] *Ibid.*, c. 30, 262: Cuius novae fabricae parietes decem pedum mensura vidimus altiores . . . Capellam . . . prius parvam . . . ampliari et ut hodie est meliorari fecit . . . capellam deiecit et hodiernam fecit, maiorem quidem quantitate sed longe imparem sanctitate.

[70] *Ibid.*, c. 29, 261: Sub hoc episcopo primitus apud nos coepit veterum aedificiorum deiectio et novorum aedificatio. Antecessores eius imis et mediocribus aedificiis contenti erant. . . . Iste vero episcopus et omnes successores eius aut novas ecclesias aut nova palatia aut etiam castella aedificabant. Nam universum paene tempus stercorationis arationis totiusque agriculturae dum solis lapidibus componendis iugiter impenditur, et tamen debitum servitium summa severitate exigitur, prior habundantia ad inopiam, et summa laetitia quae sub prioribus episcopis erat, ad maximam redacta est tristiciam.

CHAPTER VIII

THE BISHOP AS ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATOR

In our investigation so far the fact has been repeatedly insisted upon that the bishop, for all his outside activities, centered his interest locally, in his city and in his diocese; that his services to the state were performed with an eye to increasing the endowment of the patron saint of the cathedral church with lands and privileges; that he shared, therefore, in the general tendency of the times to amass large landed estates and in the localization of economic, social and political power. For aid and support there was nowhere for the bishop to turn except to the king, unless he were content merely to possess what he had. No bishop was therewith content; his one constant obligation was to increase the wealth of his see, and never to part with any of it. Success in this meant success as a bishop. Not only was he himself aware of this, but contemporary commentators were not slow to note with approval the bishop who had been able to increase the endowment, especially the landed endowment, of his church.[1] Endowment from private sources was on the decline by the end of the ninth century and the beginning

[1] E.g., *Vita Balderici*, c. 2, *MGH, SS* IV, 725: Non enim in adquirendis municipiis vel grege militum operam adhibebat, ut plerisque episcopis est consuetudo. *Gesta epp. Camerac.*, I, 86, *MGH, SS* VIII, 432-433: Hic (Engrannus) etiam propriis rebus aecclesiam augebat, et si qua subtraherentur, publico iudicio evindicare et restituere satagebat. Thiet., II, 34, n. * (Kurze, 40): Hic (Frithericus) in fine suo gratias agit Deo quod aecclesiae suimet nil umquam iniuste acquisierit seu perdiderit. *Libell. de Willig. Consuet.*, c. 4, *MGH, SS* XV, 745: Quod prudenter acquisivit, stulte non perdidit. *Vita Bernwardi*, c. 8, *MGH, SS* IV, 761: In praediis namque tanta congessit ut triginta vel plures praecipuos curtiles cum litorum ac colonorum familiis . . . compararet, cum in aliis innumerabilibus locis decem mansos vel octo . . . in possessionem suae aecclesiae conferret. Thiet., VII, 5 (Kurze, 172): (Tagino) urbes cum curte una . . . suae acquisivit aecclesiae. Apparatum episcopalem satis egregium et affluentem congregavit; VIII, 31 (211): Is (Bernward of Verden) aecclesiam suimet CCC mansis iuste adquisitis adauxit.

of the tenth;[2] the secular nobility was interested in building up its own estates. Under these circumstances we have seen how the Saxon kings responded to the needs of the church and upon what terms. What the average size of episcopal estates during this period came to be it is impossible to say. Naturally they varied greatly; frequently they approximated sixty thousand acres.[4] To the candidate for a bishopric the current income of the see was an important consideration. We are told of a certain Hugo, who, when he learned that the income of the see of Verdun was depleted, lost all interest in his candidacy; he simply mounted his horse in a hurry and rode out of the city.[5]

Aside from royal grants, to increase his property or to round out some holding into a more natural or manageable unit the bishop could resort to purchase or, more especially, to exchange. A purchase required the expenditure of wealth already acquired, consequently the method of exchange was preferred, and no doubt more profitable. In Bavaria at Salzburg and Freising this business was particularly active. It

[2] Inama-Sternegg, II, 130, n. 1; Hauck, III, 56-58; Sommerlad (II. 202, n. 4) insists that the decline in private gifts to the church did not extend to northern Germany.

[3] *Ibid.*, 188, points out that the preponderance of grants to the church over the secular nobility is to be explained in part by the fact that the church preserved its documents better. For figures as to the numbers of large and small grants to the church during the tenth and early eleventh century, cf. *ibid.*, 128-129.

[4] At least this is the estimate of Gerdes, I, 535: *häufig auf mehr als 1000 Hufen.* A royal *Hufe* was composed of 60 *Morgen*, and a *Morgen* is approximately an acre. From a few hundred *Hufen* under Otto I the endowment of Bremen under archbishop Adalbert (1043-1072) reached approximately 1000 *Hufen* (*ibid.*). The total holdings of the church far exceeded those of the crown. Cf. R. Kötzschke, *Grundzüge der deutschen Wirtschaftsgeschichte bis zum 17. Jahrhundert*, 70.

[5] *Gesta epp. Virdun*, c. 4, *MGH, SS* IV, 47: Hic (Hugo) itaque cum ingressus fuisset civitatem, vocatis ad se ministris, unde viveret exquisivit. Quibus respondentibus se penitus carere expensis quae fuerant pontificis, et designantibus exterminationem villarum quarum reditibus vivere solebat, ascenso mox equo reversus est.

was frequently not a simple exchange of like for like. Even when it was, the bishop took great care somehow to give less than he received.[6] Furthermore, recognizing the urge of the secular nobility to increase its holdings, he entered into numerous conditional (precarious) exchanges, which for the time being turned over to the secular noble a much larger grant than was received from him, but on condition that the grant revert to the bishop after a specified time, usually after the grantee's death. Thus he satisfied the ambition of the noble to increase his holdings and yet in the long run actually enriched his own see.[7] Similar contracts were made with the members of the bishop's own family,[8] but in such cases the danger was much greater that the terms of the contract would not be enforced by the bishop or his successor, and that the property would then be permanently lost. Indeed, the danger of alienating property to relatives Otto I met, when he assumed control over the Bavarian episcopate, by granting to the reigning bishops the right to cancel all such previous exchanges.[9]

The ninth century had witnessed the beginning of a differentation of church property into that reserved for the maintenance of the chapter and the upkeep of the church and its services, the chapter property (*Kapitelsgut*), and that which supported the outside political and social activities of the bishop, the bishop's property (*Prälatengut*).[10] It has been

[6] Inama-Sternegg, II, 131, and n. 1, for examples: e. g., Episc. II iug. minus quam accepit retradidit.

[7] *Ibid.*, 130, and n. 2, for examples: e.g., Freising in return for property and four serfs deeds property with a tithe church and twelve serfs: eo tenore ut O. et pater eius usque ad finem vitae suae possideant et post obitum amborum ad eccles. data omnia et accepta cum foetu et factura redeant.

[8] Hirsch, *JB H II*, I, 47.

[9] Riezler, I, 389. Widmann, I, 178-189, discusses the Salzburg *Traditionsbuch*, containing 108 exchanges for archbishop Odalbert, 24 for Frederick, and 38 for Hartwich. Odalbert exchanged property with his wife, sons, daughters, and grandchildren, Frederick with his brother, and Hartwich with relatives, including a nephew.

[10] Pöschl, 26-27; Aubin-Levison, 70.

recognized that the church's administration of both these classes of its property was distinctly superior to lay and royal administration.[11] There were no partitions among heirs, no necessary family interests to consider. There was a permanent and definite center of administration, where proper accounts could be kept. There was the protection that came from the state and from the canon law. Tithes furnished the basis for a steady income. There was also the inheritance of knowledge and technique from Roman agriculture. In turning over land and economically decayed monasteries to the bishops, the Saxon kings were increasing the productivity of the soil. Their special recognition of the bishop's administrative talent along this line is evident in that on at least two occasions Henry II turned over to the archbishops of Magdeburg the management of the crown lands in Saxony.[12] Episcopal administration, needless to say, was not necessarily milder; there were plenty of complaints of the episcopal strong hand.[13]

In addition to lands, cultivated and uncultivated, forest and clear, with their necessary buildings, there were the serfs, the mills and breweries, the tolls, mints, markets, all to be taken care of. These required an episcopal officialdom, some-

[11] Ficker, 399: die kirchliche Güterverwaltung durchweg eine geordnetere, nutzbringendere war als die der Laien. Cf. Nitzsch, I, 374; Thompson, *Feudal Germany*, 38.

[12] Thiet., V, 39 (Kurze, 129): commissisque ei (Giseler) omnibus in Saxonia suimet proprietatibus fidelem in hiis persensit provisorem; VII, 7 (174): archiepiscopo (Walter) . . . suas curtes in Saxonia positas commendavit.

[13] *Vita Oudal.*, c. 28, *MGH, SS* IV, 418, of Henry of Augsburg: Familiae autem plus iusto saevior extitit, eorum ius tollendo et in quibusdam locis novum censum creando. *Anon. Haser.*, c. 19, *MGH, SS* VII, 258, of Megingaud of Eichstätt: Cum autem familiam sancti Willibaldi inprimis durius tractasset, tandemque clamor eorum ad aures clementissimi patroni pervenisset. The author goes on to narrate that St. Willibald appeared in a vision to a cleric with the message: Vade et dic episcopo, nisi velit familiam meam clementius tractare, quantocius debet locum meliori dare. . . . Quo audito et viso, episcopus ultra quam credi potest perterritus, utcunque tamen mitior est factus.

thing more than merely an advocate to supervise all changes in episcopal property, whose powers were essentially judicial. This officialdom was developed out of the bishop's servile household or from his peasantry into a loyal episcopal administrative staff, which could be used to defend the bishop in his struggles with the advocate. These were the episcopal *ministeriales*. The four royal court officials, the chamberlain, the marshal, the steward and the cup-bearer, introduced into the episcopal household, were taken from the *ministerialis* class.[14] Of these the chamberlain in charge of episcopal revenue was the most important. In addition there was the *vicedominus*, who at least at Hildesheim seems to have been a general supervisor of episcopal property.[15] The numerous chaplains we need no more than mention. The bishops were thus putting on the outward show of kings, whose courts they were imitating.[16]

---

[14] They are to be found in Freising under Abraham, at Worms under Burchard. Bruno of Cologne had his *purpuratos ministros*. (*Vita Brunonis*, c. 30, Pertz, 30). Udalrich was accompanied on his visitations by *electi de familia* (*ministeriales*) and *ministros* (*Vita Oudal.*, c. 5, *MGH, SS* IV, 494).

[15] *Vita Godehardi posterior*, c. 39, *MGH, SS* XI, 217: Wolcwardus presbiter, eo tempore vicedominus, . . . cum . . . episcopales curtes more solito circuiret.

[16] A. Barth, *Das bischöfliche Beamtentum im Mittelalter*, 3-55; Nitzsch, I, 377-378; Sommerlad, II, 273 ff.; Inama-Sternegg, II, 44 ff., 91 ff. *et passim.*

Mon. Hist. Lobiensis, c. 11, *MGH, SS* XIV, 552: Episcopus Leodiensis duplici gladio potens, quasi rex magnus, quasi sacerdos magnus, in cathedra Leodiensi sedere solebat; implebant et ornabant atque roborabant curiam frequentem militum familia magna, fortis et sapiens, magni principes et prudentes, clerus magnus et honestus. Cf. Kurth, 207. Bruno's soldiers were resplendent with gold, although he himself lived with extreme simplicity: *Vita Brunonis*, c. 30 (Pertz, 30): inter purpuratos ministros et milites suos auroque nitidos vilem ipse tunicam et rusticanas ovium pelles induxit. We meet with this sort of comment not infrequently in the biographies of the bishops. No doubt the best of them labored solely *ad maiorem gloriam episcopatus*, which they naturally identified with *maiorem gloriam Dei*. Yet one may wonder

But it is from the careers of individual bishops that we best learn, although with too little detail, of the attention given to the cultivators and the cultivation of the soil, as well as to other economic matters. Willigis of Mainz, called the richest man of his time, was to be found, if a later eulogizer can be trusted, going the rounds of his lands, taking pains to spend an equal amount of time at each stop in order not to use unequally the produce supplied for his keeping, and arranging for the payments to be made from his manors.[17] Böhmer suggests that in carving out new parishes for new churches and turning these over with their new income of tithes to newly founded canonries he was engaging in a form of speculation whose purpose was not wholly religious.[18] Udalrich of Augsburg before becoming bishop had had many years of experience as the financial administrator of bishop Adalbero of Augsburg,[19] and for fourteen years was the administrator of the very large land holdings of his own family. Adalbero's successor he refused to serve because he was not a sufficiently distinguished person.[20] As bishop he was concerned that his peasantry should not be oppressed, nor lose the rights in law that they had acquired,[21] nor suffer financial oppression from his agents.[22] On his visitations

whether there may not have been a bit of art in just such a contrast between the splendor of the bishop's retainers and his own ostentatious simplicity. Cf. chapter IX, pp. 247-248, and n. 32.

[17] *Libell. de Willig. Consuet.*, c. 4, *MGH, SS* XV, 745: non fuit ditior illo de acquisito lucro iustissimo. . . . In omni circulo loca sua peragravit tempore certo et in singulis delectatio manendi sibimet erat aequalis, ideoque usum ab illis sumpsit aequalem et copiam in illis reservavit eandem. Cf. Böhmer, 128 ff.

[18] *Ibid.*, 151 and 127: Das sind zufällig überlieferte Beispiele für ein wahrscheinlich öfter, auch in eigenem Interesse, befolgtes Verfahren grundherrlicher Spekulation im Ausgange des 10. Jahrhunderts.

[19] *Vita Oudal.*, c. 1, *MGH, SS* IV, 387: ministerium camerarii sibi commendavit.

[20] *Vita Oudal.*, c. 1, *MGH, SS* IV, 387: tantae non fuit celsitudinis ut suo se vellet applicuisse servicio.

[21] *Ibid.*, c. 3, 390; c. 5, 394: ius familiae dissolvere non concessit.

[22] *Ibid.*, c. 3, 390: et non nisi rectum censum de omnibus locis aliquem suorum ministrorum ab ea exigere consensit.

through his diocese he took along with him vassals that could be called upon for advice in the administration of secular as well as religious affairs.[23] He was careful not to let the best monasteries out of his hands; only as the result of personal supervision could he be sure that everything, including monastic buildings and payments, was in order.[24] Newly founded churches had to be provided with a suitable endowment before he would consecrate them.[25] Here was a careful, strict, capable and benevolent administrator.

The diocese of Hildesheim in the persons of Bernward and Godehard was blessed with two bishops of uncommon administrative ability. Bernward personally supervised his own manors, stimulating the cultivation of land lying unused.[26] But in particular, it is here in the heart of Saxony that we find the most persistent encouragement of those arts and crafts that had to do with the adornment of churches. Bernward himself had the endowment of an artist, as he showed not only in his own wide interests but in the zeal with which he put his own hands to work in the creation of beautiful things. He was interested in calligraphy and in the foundation of *scriptoria*.[27] He was to be found with an apron on, engaged in painting, quite probably himself decorating the

---

[23] *Vita Oudal.*, c. 5, *MGH, SS* IV, 393: de vasallis suis semper secum aliquos sapientissimos habere voluit, si ei aliquod negocium de aecclesiasticis vel de secularibus ad tractandum deveniret, ut eorum consilio caute tractare et regere semper paratus esset.

[24] *Ibid.*: ad suam potestatem optima quaeque detinuit, ea videlicet causa, ut facultatem ea visitandi et ibi manendi et quae necessaria erant corrigendi in stipendiis habuisset.

[25] *Ibid.*, c. 7, 395.

[26] *Vita Bernwardi*, c. 1, *MGH, SS* IV, 758: In negociis vero domesticis et ad usum rei familiaris pertinentibus vivacissimus executor acsi a puero his nutritus calluit; c. 8, 761: Antiqua quippe loca ab antecessoribus suis possessa, quae ille inculta reperit, optimis aedificiis collustravit.

[27] *Ibid.*, c. 1, 758: In scribendo vero adprime enituit; c. 6, 760: Scriptoria namque non in monasterio tantum sed in diversis locis studebat.

walls and ceilings of his churches.[28] He encouraged or himself practiced sculpture, the silver- and goldsmith's art, gem setting.[29] New objects imported as gifts for the king did not escape his eye, and his impressions were undoubtedly transmitted to his artisans.[30] Indeed, to the workmen in the episcopal shops both Bernward and his successor Godehard devoted daily personal attention; inspection of the workshops was part of their ordinary routine.[31] Youths of talent he took with him to court or wherever he had to stay for some time, in order that they might learn from the various works of art that they would see.[32] Hildesheim workshops were thus kept alive with new ideas, and fresh talent was enlivened. As an architect Bernward was also original: he designed buildings in red and white stone and mosaics for floors. At Hildesheim the first tiles for roofing were manufactured.[33]

---

[28] *Vita Bernwardi*, c. 1, *MGH, SS* IV, 758: picturam etiam limate exercuit; c. 8, 761: Ecclesiam namque miro studio decorare ardenter instabat. Unde exquisita et lucida pictura tam parietes quam laquearia exornabat, ut ex veteri novam putares.

[29] *Ibid.*, c. 1, 758: fabrili quoque scientia et arte clusoria . . .. mirifice excelluit; c. 6, 760: Picturam vero et sculpturam et fabrilem atque clusoriam artem, et quicquid elegantius in huiusmodi arte excogitare poterat, numquam neglectum patiebatur.

[30] *Ibid.*: ut ex transmarinis et ex Scotticis vasis, quae regali maiestati singulari dono deferebantur, quicquid rarum vel eximium reperiret, incultum transire non sineret.

[31] *Vita Bernwardi*, c. 5, *MGH, SS* IV, 760: Inde officinas ubi diversi usus metalla fiebant circuens, singulorum opera librabat. *Vita Godehardi prior*, c. 38, *MGH, SS* XI, 195: missali officio aut audito aut per semet ipsum sepius decantato, ad operarios exiebat, quorum innumerabilem multitudinem per diversas operum utilitates . . . cotidie nisi in festis exercebat.

[32] *Vita Bernwardi*, c. 6, *MGH, SS* IV, 760: Ingeniosos namque pueros et eximiae indolis secum vel ad curtem ducebat vel quocumque longius commeabat, quos, quicquid dignius in ulla arte occurrebat, ad exercitium impellebat.

[33] *Ibid.*, c. 8, 761: inter quae (aedificia) quaedam elegantiori scemate albo ac rubro lapide intermiscens, musiva pictura varia pulcherrimum opus reddidit; c. 6, 760: Musivum praeterea in pavimentis ornandis studium, necnon lateres ad tegulam propria industria nullo monstrante composuit.

Some of the products of these busy workshops, notably the bronze doors of the cathedral, are still to be seen at Hildesheim.[34]

Thietmar of Merseburg was proud of the relics and reliquaries, the incense-burners, the gold altar and the other ecclesiastical furnishings that he had acquired for his church, which he included with manors and serfs as important additions, not only to be listed and treasured, but to be increased.[35] The previous suppression and partition of his diocese, however, imposed upon Thietmar the particular task of making sure that everything that had belonged to Merseburg not already restored should come back to him. He had to contend with two fellow bishops who were just as insistent that as little as possible that had come to them from Merseburg should go back to him. In such a predicament Thietmar not only had to be continually reminding the archbishop of Magdeburg and the bishop of Meissen of what was his due, but had also to keep Henry II reminded that what was his due had not come to him. After he had insisted that the Madgeburg chapter exercise its right of election by choosing a successor to Tagino in 1012, and after the chapter had indicated its choice of Walter, Thietmar asked him personally if, should he become archbishop, he would not take an oath that he would restore to Merseburg what Magdeburg was keeping from him.[36] Thietmar got the promise. When he was at court to participate in Walter's election there, he took occa-

---

[34] Lüntzel, I, 166 ff. Similarly Willigis was probably the first to apply bronze casting to artistic purposes at Mainz.

[35] Thiet., IX, 13 (Kurze, 247): Sanctorum reliquias et munda eorum receptacula cum aliis utilitatibus plurimis tam in prediis quam in mancipiis ego acquisivi, et ne . . . forsitan laterent, martirologio inscripsi meo; *ibid.*, 14 (248): quod a nobis non modo est observandum verum eciam aucmentandum.

[36] *Ibid.*, VII, 2 (171): Tunc ego me inclinans rogavi eum per nomen Domini et per verae fraternitatis amorem, ut aecclesiae meimet admodum despoliatae parrochiam sibi iuste pertinentem, si ad hunc perveniret honorem, restituere aut sibi hanc cum aliis rebus inde abstractis voluisset sacramentis firmare. Cf. Chapter II, n. 167.

sion to ask Henry II to speak with Walter concerning the needs of Merseburg.[37] He got another promise. But Walter died without having done anything about the matter; "he was a strong defender of the church."[38] After Walter's death and another letter to Henry II about Merseburg's losses, now that there was to be a new archbishop, Thietmar betook himself to Seehausen to talk to the king about his diocese. Before the whole court he advised Henry to have a talk with Gero, the prospective archbishop, about the diocese of Merseburg before the election was confirmed, a plain hint to make restoration to Merseburg a condition of his promotion to Magdeburg.[39] Henry promised that he would take care of the matter. Finally, after again reminding Gero of his "sweet promises," Thietmar got what he was after.[40] With the bishop of Meissen he was not so successful. Frequent complaints to the emperor and restitutions on paper had led him to believe that his hopes would be fulfilled. At Merseburg, in the presence of Henry, Gero of Magdeburg, Meinwerk of Paderborn, Eilward of Meissen, and the bishops of Brandenburg and Havelburg, Thietmar arose to make a final lamentation. But he was obliged to give what he did not wish to give and to receive what he never wanted. Yet, he says, "I testify before God and all his saints that what was left I have in no way neglected."[41] Thietmar was a protest-

[37] Thiet., VII, 7 (Kurze, 173): Deinde regiam interpellabam pietatem ut de aecclesiae necessitatibus meae aliquid loqui [cum eo] dignaretur; et ut ego postulabam, firmae suimet commisit [me] fidei.

[38] *Ibid.*, 15 (177): aecclesiae suimet fortis propugnator erat.

[39] *Ibid.*, 21 (181): ego accedebam et, cum iam tempus esset, ammonui hunc coram cunctis residentibus, ut aliquid de parrochia meimet caeterisque rebus iniuste ablatis ante constitucionem archipresulis cum eo voluisset tractare.

[40] *Ibid.*, VIII, 24 (207): tunc ego de promissis dulcibus eum ammonens percepi ab eodem . . . parrochiam super has IIII urbes . . . et villam.

[41] Thiet., VIII, 52 (Kurze, 225): Sed cum ego multa sepe questus sim imperatori de parte meimet parrochiae ab aecclesia Misnensi iniuste ablata et scriptis restituta, cumque bona inde mihi profutura sperarem, aliter quam ratus sum hoc evenire cognoscebam . . . cum sederet im-

ing bishop; one gets the impression that perhaps he protested too much to be agreeable, though hardly too much to get what he wanted.

As we have seen in the case of Bernward of Hildesheim, the accumulation and management of property, while it was generally the chief concern of the tenth century bishop, was by no means his sole concern. Burchard of Worms was an administrator of a still different kind. He had been trained under the tutelage of Willigis of Mainz, first as a simple cleric and then as his representative in all affairs of administration affecting the inhabitants of the city of Mainz; his biographer calls him *camerae magistrum ac civitatis primatem*.[42] At Worms he found utter confusion and desolation,[43] and a dangerous fort maintained by a local noble within the city.[44] These conditions he set about immediately and successfully to ameliorate. But a still larger problem confronted him. There was no fixity for his diocese in canon law or penitential discipline. There was not only the confusion of a multiplicity of old regulations made by king, pope, councils, and synods, gathered up in various collections of canon law; there was also conflict within the regulations themselves. Penitential books were likewise numerous. The clergy of his diocese were too ignorant even of the general purport of canon law to be troubled by contradictions or inconsistencies in its provisions. Furthermore, many of these old provisions could no longer be said to correspond to actual conditions in the early eleventh century such as Burchard found to exist about him. Burchard, therefore, not trusting to the inspiration of the moment, set about drawing up systemati-

---

perator et presentes episcopi adessent . . . surrexi et lamentationem meam feci. Tunc imperator et archiantistes, a quibus sperabam auxilium, iusserunt mihi, Deus scit invito, qui hiis resistere non presumpsi, ut parrochiam . . . concederem et quam ille . . . teneret, mihi hoc numquam desideranti relinqueret. . . . Testificor coram Deo et omnibus sanctis eius, id quod residuum fuit tunc nullo modo dereliqui.

[42] *Vita Burchardi*, c. 2, *MGH, SS* IV, 833.

[43] See ch. VII, p. 220.

[44] See ch. II, pp. 60-61.

cally in writing a collection of canons and penitential regulations intended to make available to his clergy the existing law, freed from internal contradiction and applicable to the conditions of their day. The result was his *Liber Decretorum*.[45] It cannot be said that Burchard aimed at shaping any new line of policy.[46] He was in no sense revolutionary. He did not, however, content himself with a mere arrangement of old regulations, but modified and changed as he saw fit to meet contemporary conditions, though always in the spirit of what had already been done. Moreover, in what he chose, changed or omitted, he showed himself to be a typical tenth century prelate, insisting upon every advantage that the law allowed, emphasizing the position of the bishop both as ecclesiastical and secular lord, endeavoring to centralize in the cathedral city of which he was master all the affairs of the diocese. It is particularly worthy of note that, while acknowledging in the pope no superior jurisdiction over the church, he did provide for the frequent interference of the German king in church affairs and for the loyal cooperation of the clergy with him.[47]

Burchard's concern for law and order did not stop with canonical and penitential regulaion. As lord of the city of Worms and bishop of the diocese he was responsible for the large body of servile workmen and peasants that ministered to the needs of the episcopal court. These had acquired in the course of time a body of rights in law, to which the urban development of Worms had contributed, and of which it had helped them to become conscious. The churlish exploitation of this dependent population by advocate, *vicedominus* and *ministerialis* seemed to Burchard to call for a formulation of what was their proper legal status. On the other hand, the serfs within the city were so intractable as to endanger the pacific development of Worms. In the country the wild fight-

[45] Printed in Migne, *PL*, CXL, 538.

[46] Hauck, *Ueber den liber decretorum Burchards von Worms*, in BSGW, Phil.-Hist. Classe., vol. 46 (1894), 65-88.

[47] Koeniger, *Burchard*, 3 ff.; Boos, I, 259-262.

ing between the peasantry of Worms and Lorsch had become scandalous and intolerable. Burchard, accordingly, desiring to find a remedy for these conditions that would put rich and poor alike on a common footing before the law, formulated his *Hofrecht*, among the very earliest pieces of legislation of its kind.[48] This ordinance of private law deals in large part with matters more fundamental than the mere regulation of manorial services. It attempts to regulate trials in court and legal punishments. It aims also at the preservation of the integrity of the episcopal *familia* by forbidding outside marriages, and of the servile holdings by forbidding the alienation of land held by the various classes of dependents. It endeavors to limit trial by battle within the city; to suppress personal brawls and prevent bloodshed by providing heavy fines for those who draw the sword, put an arrow to the bow string or poise a lance; to restrict the still existent institution of private blood revenge.[49] It is the work of an ardent, self-conscious, sympathetic civilizer.

The colorful personality of Meinwerk of Paderborn was long treasured in the monastery of Abdinghof, which he founded in 1015.[50] He was a man made to become a tradition.

---

[48] The prologue, quoted by Sommerlad, II, 270, n. 4, a fine example of the benevolent bishop at his best, runs as follows: Ego Burchardus Wormatiensis ecclesiae episcopus propter assiduas lamentationes miserorum et crebras insidias multorum qui more canino familiam s. Petri dilacerabant, diversas leges eis imponentes et infirmiores quosque suis iudiciis opprimentes, cum consilio cleri et militum et totius familiae has iussi scribere leges, ne aliquis advocatus aut vicedominus aut ministerialis sive inter eos alia aliqua loquax persona supradictae familiae novi aliquid subinferre posset, sed una eademque lex diviti et pauperi ante oculos prenotata omnibus esset communis.

[49] Boos, I, 291-307; Inama-Sternegg, II, 80 ff.; Hauck, III, 438 ff.

[50] The *Vita Meinwerci* was written by a monk of Abdinghof in the twelfth century, some hundred years after the bishop's death. It makes industrious use of a multitude of Paderborn documents and local contemporary sources, which give it its chief value. It preserves the rich tradition of Meinwerk as a friend of Henry II, as a paternal administrator of rapidly increasing estates, and as just Meinwerk. The depiction is chiefly through anecdotes, which, in view of the date of

It was not the tradition of a learned bishop. Although Meinwerk had his own ideas about the severity with which youth should be brought up, his familiarity with the intricacies of the Latin language was so slight as to be notorious. Indeed, Henry II, who had not chosen Meinwerk to be bishop because of his Latin,[51] knew this well enough and was not averse to twitting him occasionally on his ignorance. We are told that on one occasion he asked Meinwerk to read a mass for his father and mother, after he and his chaplain had erased from the missal the first syllable of the words *famulis* and *famulabus*. They therefore enjoyed listening to a mass for the souls of he- and she-mules and to Meinwerk's tardy correction of his mistake. The king Meinwerk could only accuse of having made sport of him again, but the king's chaplain he had soundly beaten.[52] Nor was it the tradition of a pious bishop. Meinwerk was sceptical of the pretensions of hermits.[53] He was also unwilling to use in taking an oath just any relics that happened to be brought in; he preferred his own.[54] His enemies went so far as to call him an idiot and a jester.[55]

The tradition of Meinwerk was rather the tradition, first of all, of a bishop who was on the friendliest terms with his king and emperor. Their friendship was such as to permit Meinwerk quietly to remove from imperial quarters, while the emperor was intent on other matters, a beautifully worked coverlet, and to retort to the emperor's charge of theft that it was more fitting that such a decoration hang in

writing, it is hardly safe to accept as absolute fact in every detail. Yet there seem to be no denying the authenticity of the main features of the portrait in the *Vita*; it is too well confirmed by the abundant variety of similar detail.

[51] *Vita Meinwerci*, c. 186, *MGH*, SS XI, 150: Sciens autem imperator episcopum . . . tam in latinitatis locutione quam in lectione barbarismi vitia non semel incurrere.

[52] *Vita Meinwerci*, c. 186, *MGH*, *SS* XI, 150.

[53] *Ibid.*, cc. 12-13, 113.

[54] *Ibid.*, c. 135, 134.

[55] *Ibid.*, c. 163, 141.

God's temple than that it be used to cover the mortal body of an emperor.[56] It was the kind of friendship that brought the king frequently to Paderborn, and once, when instructions were sent ahead that a bath be made ready, set Meinwerk to preparing a bathrobe made from the skins of unborn lambs and trimmed in red marten.[57] Emperor and bishop were continually harassing each other with practical jokes. Once Meinwerk was tricked into believing his end was near, and only after five days of preparation for it did he catch on to the fact that he was the victim of more imperial humor. The next morning Henry II hailed him as a new Lazarus.[58] Such a friendship no bishop could fail to utilize as well as enjoy. In his own right Meinwerk was a very rich man, and out of his own wealth contributed generously to the endowment of Paderborn, which at the beginning of his episcopate was a poor church.[59] Indeed, like Unwan of Hamburg-Bremen and Thietmar of Merseburg, he was appointed by Henry II for just that reason, on the presumption that the see would be enriched by gifts from his patrimony. Yet he did not intend to be the sole benefactor of Paderborn. He hoped that his own generosity would stimulate that of his neighbors,[60] and even to his hosts he frankly suggested that certain of their properties would do wonderfully well for Paderborn; they might be presented outright or he might be willing to buy

---

[56] *Vita Meinwerci*, c. 186, *MGH, SS* XI, 149-150.

[57] *Ibid.*, c. 181, 148. The story goes on to tell that, when Henry jokingly complained that such a robe was unworthy of the dignity of an emperor, Meinwerk had in merchants to prove its worth and then burst forth: Ego, Heinrice, pro corpore tuo mortali vestiendo pauperem beatae Mariae semper virginis episcopatum, a te mihi collatum, devastavi; canonicos eius, villicos ac mendicos . . . fraudavi et spoliavi.

[58] *Vita Meinwerci*, c. 187, *MGH, SS* XI, 150.

[59] The *Vita* reports (c. 29, 118) that Meinwerk at the dedication of the newly renovated cathedral church in 1015 turned over to his see 1100 manors: Episcopus autem de bonis hereditariis in Saxonia positis urbem . . . cum undecies centum mansis . . . ecclesiae delegavit et confirmavit.

[60] *Ibid.*, c. 29, 118.

them.[61] With Henry II he felt no need to be so tactful. He knew that to get gifts from the king he had to perform services for the king,[62] and this he did in great abundance.[63] Nevertheless, his own tempestuous nature, which he may have got from his mother,[64] and the fact that he knew Henry II so well, led him to use every manner of means to wheedle out of the king property that he considered a little slow in forthcoming.[65] If there were new buildings to be dedicated at Paderborn Henry was sure to be invited to be present, for on such occasions royal generosity was almost certain to be exercised.[66] He took advantage of a case of bad conscience from which the king was suffering to suggest that such mental anguish could always be assuaged by generosity to the church at Paderborn.[67] Indeed, Meinwerk's persistence was so dogged that Henry, to avoid unseemly public scenes, had to have on his person for almost any occasion some grant to slake his unquenchable thirst for property. Once the bishop is reported to have actually interrupted his reading of high mass at the offertory to refuse a particular oblation of the king and to demand instead a certain royal property that he coveted, which he got before resuming the service. Henry

[61] *Vita Meinwerci*, c. 13, *MGH, SS* XI, 114.

[62] *Ibid.*, c. 12, 113: ut tamen exteriorum providentiam pro subiectorum necessitatibus supplendis non negligeret, regni negotiis, ut compellebatur, inservire cepit.

[63] *Vita Meinwerci*, c. 180, *MGH, SS* XI, 148: episcopo domi forisque negotiis regni multipliciter occupato; c. 186, 150: episcopum saecularibus negotiis multipliciter occupatum.

[64] Cf. ch. III, p. 141.

[65] *Vita Meinwerci*, c. 184, *MGH, SS* XI, 149: Variis autem modis et temporibus ecclesiae commissae prospiciens episcopus oportune importune imperatori institit, et nunc gratuito oblata cum gratiarum actione suscipere, nunc negata pie violentus praeripere non destitit; c. 12, 113: Continue autem regi insistens ut ecclesiae sibi commissae . . . succurreret.

[66] *Ibid.*, c. 29, 118: Episcopus autem sperans se ab imperatore Ervete impetraturum, eum dedicationi interesse postulaverat; c. 180, 148: sperans eum imperiali magnificentia aliqua daturum praedia in praesentia eius hoc (monastery of Abdinghof) dedicare proposuit.

[67] *Ibid.*, c. 165, 141.

complained that he was being despoiled by Meinwerk to the prejudice of the realm, but Meinwerk replied by calling him blessed: such a gift was atonement for sin.[68] Yet Henry knew that by rewarding such a genuine and faithful servitor as Meinwerk he was making clear once for all what reward service to the king and emperor might bring to a loyal bishop.[69] It is hardly surprising that Meinwerk made of Paderborn an affluent see.

In the second place, Meinwerk left behind him also the memory of a bishop not only insatiable in the accumulation of property but meticulous in his care of it. He supervised personally the workmen who built his buildings. He had Greek artisans brought into Paderborn to build a church.[70] He had his own goldsmiths, whom he could call upon at any moment.[71] He put in charge of various operations suitable masters.[72] If a passing workman applied to Meinwerk for a job, he was first set to work to show what he could do.[73] Within Paderborn itself he set aside plots for the use of workmen and artisans serving the episcopal court, providing

---

[68] *Vita Meinwerci*, c. 182, *MGH, SS* XI, 149: sciens (Henry II) se in die iniuriam ab episcopo habiturum, ascitis primo diluculo notariis, occulte fieri fecit de Ervete privilegium. After Henry had finally handed the document over at high mass: Episcopus autem gaudio repletus ineffabili: Omnium sanctorum, exclamat, retribuat tibi! Et imperator averso vultu occulte submurmurans: Et tu, inquid, odium Dei omniumque sanctorum eius habeas, qui me bonis concessis cum detrimento regni spoliare non cessas. Episcopus autem privilegium cum manu in altum exaltans: Beatus es, ait, Heinrice, et bene tibi erit. . . . Videte, ait, omnes populi, considerate fideles universi; talis oblatio peccatorum fit abolitio.

[69] *Ibid.*, 168, 144: quandam curtim . . . episcopo Meinwerco imperator tribuit, ob iuge suum et indefessum servitium, ut ipse nullius emuli opprobriis subiaceret, quin plus omnibus serviens praemia honoresque plures acciperet, exemplisque sui emolumenti alios ad suum fidele servitium imperator provocaret.

[70] Wattenbach, II, 33 f.

[71] *Vita Meinwerci*, c. 182, *MGH, SS* XI, 148: ascitisque aurificibus suis Brunhardo et filio eius Erphone.

[72] *Vita Meinwerci*, c. 12, *MGH, SS* XI, 113: Prepositis autem operi singulis magistris.

[73] *Ibid.*, c. 12, 112-113.

them at the same time wih food and clothing.[74] This scion of the noblest Saxon blood had a deep respect for the capable workman. With equal care he supervised the stewards who administered his manors. He was constantly making the rounds, now relieving the pressure of existence by diminishing the rigor of earlier manorial requisitions, now ordering the stewards to dole out food and drink at harvest time,[75] on one manor increasing the supply of meat to the workers,[76] or again removing from the manor of an exacting steward a poverty-striken widow.[77] On the occasion of a famine he had grain brought from Cologne.[78] And so, if his paternalism was rough and exacting, if his methods of detecting neglect were sly, he made up for it by the sincerity of his intent and the good nature and kindliness that lay at the heart of his nature. Sometimes he even went about in disguise, slipping into the kitchen of a monastery dressed as a layman or traveling about in the garb of a peddler.[79] When he came upon carelessness and neglect he was unsparing in his punishment. When he found, in an attempt to test the loyalty of serfs to their steward, that they made no attempt to prevent damage to the grain by the bishop's men, he had

[74] *Vita Meinwerci*, c. 131, *MGH, SS* XI, 132: Areas autem versus occidentem ex utraque parte Patherae contiguas diversis curiae servitoribus et artificibus . . . deputavit, et in cotidiani ministerii necessitatibus, in alimentorum vestimentorumque utilitatibus, non minus decenter quam utiliter filiis suis prospicere curavit.

[75] *Ibid.*, c. 146, 137: Curtes dominicales episcopii sui circumiens frequenter, collapsa reparabat, reparata munimine sui firmabat sollerter. . . . Duram antiquae servitutis litorum iusticiam per novam paternae pietatis relevavit gratiam; constituens a villicis amminiculari eis in cibi potusque necessariis, quod antea non fiebat, tempore messis.

[76] *Ibid.*, c. 147, 138.

[77] *Ibid.*, c. 150, 138.

[78] *Ibid.*, c. 151, 138.

[79] *Vita Meinwerci*, c. 153, *MGH, SS* XI, 139: subiectorum fidelitatem et dilectionem, singulorum spem et devotionem in Deum experiri voluit per se; assumensque cuiusdam mercatoris cum mercibus habitum circuibat sedulus explorator episcopatum. The stewards caught on to this and instructed their wives to call for help, should Meinwerk come along offering his wares.

them severely flogged."[80] The next time the bishop's men had difficulty in getting into the manor at all. When Meinwerk found the garden of the well-dressed wife of one of his stewards full of weeds, he had her stripped of her fine clothes and rolled about the garden until the tall growth was flattened down, and then in his usual generous way consoled her.[81] Once he was distressed to find a woman who had not a chicken in her yard. When she complained that there was nothing for them to eat, to supply the deficiency he prescribed an extremely simple and practical method, no doubt less unconventional in the tenth century than it may seem today, which we are told was eminently successful.[82]

[80] *Vita Meinwerci,* c. 147, *MGH, SS* XI, 137: servi infidelitatis et incuriositatis vicio multum incusati iussu eius gravissime virgis sunt flagellati.

[81] *Ibid.,* c. 148, 138: uxorem villici ambitiosis suis vestibus spoliari praecipiens, donec germen noxium quod in altum excreverat terrae coequaretur, per totum hortum eam trahi mandavit. Quam tristem consuetis blanditiis consolans, solita liberalitate exhilaravit; sequentique anno omni diligentia et habundantia totum ortum excultum inveniens, maiori gratiarum actione et munerum largitione eam remuneravit.

[82] *Vita Meinwerci,* c. 149, *MGH, SS* XI, 138: penuriam pastus ea conquerente, mandavit ei, ut fieri faceret quod ad pastum pullorum de loco ad locum per curiam moveri per temporum intervalla provideret. When Meinwerk appeared for another inspection, he was delighted to find an abundance of chickens: qui creverant de pastu minutorum vermiculorum.

CHAPTER IX

EPICURUS EPISCOPUS

This phrase was used to characterize bishop Megingaud by an unknown monk of the monastery of Herrenried at Eichstätt, who wrote a chronicle of Eichstätt after the middle of the eleventh century, about fifty years after the bishop's death.[1] Megingaud differed so completely from his predecessor, Reginald, that comparison was striking and inevitable. Whereas the gentle and kindly Reginald was learned in Greek and Latin and Hebrew, an ingenious composer, in fact the best musician of his day,[2] Megingaud's education, like Meinwerk's, was nothing better than average, and he was, moreover, severe and irascible.[3] He was a bishop around whom a legend grew so quickly that no chronicler could afford to dismiss him lightly. The particular incident that occasioned the application of the epithet "epicurean" to Megingaud serves also to bring into relief some of his other engaging qualities. He was accustomed to exchange gifts with the bishop of Würzburg, to whom he sent fish from the Danube and various kinds of fancy garments, receiving in return quantities of Würzburg's best wine. The impatience with which he awaited the arrival of these wagonloads of wine was so well known in Würzburg that the bishop once took the occasion to play a little joke on Megingaud. He arranged that the wine should arrive late, and then had Megingaud informed that it was not the delicate wine of Würzburg at all, but some skins of must. At this announcement Megingaud not only called the Würzburg agent a number of highly uncomplimentary and undignified names,[4] but expressed the opinion that an

[1] *Anon. Haser.*, c. 22, *MGH, SS* VII, 260.

[2] *Ibid.*, c. 12, 257: litteris non solum Latinis et Grecis sed etiam Hebreis imbutus et, quod unicum et singulare in eo fuit, optimus huius temporis musicus.

[3] *Ibid.*, c. 15, 258: hic vero mediocriter erat litteratus . . . severus et iracundus.

[4] E.g., *Anon. Haser.*, c. 22, *MGH, SS* VII, 259: furcifer, trifurcifer, filius meretricis.

empty-headed king did not know what he was doing to give such a bishopric to such a man.[5] When he discovered the truth, however, he observed that a wise emperor could not have done better than to bestow upon Würzburg such an ornament to his calling as his beloved colleague.[6]

This incident suggests that Megingaud was a man of temperament as fickle as forcible, given to strong language, and sensitive to the claims of what he called "the impatience of his belly," which he confessed was hard on his peasantry.[7] His profanity was not only a convenient outlet for his feelings; it just came natural to him even when not strongly moved.[8] Before starting on a journey to Rome on which, obliged to contend with the queer folkways of an alien people, he foresaw the same occasions for the loosening of the tongue that most travelers in that enchanting land experience, he secured from his chapter permission to swear one hundred times on the journey. But this meagre supply was so soon exhausted on the way that he had to send back to the chapter for several supplementary hundreds.[9] For a man with an impatient stomach it was intolerable that parents should present to him to be confirmed a son endowed with a name of such evil connotation as Fastolf. Being unable conscientiously to confirm a boy with such a name he simply ordered

---

[5] *Anon. Haser.*, c. 22, *MGH, SS* VII, 259: Fatuus rex quid faceret ignoravit, cum tali talem episcopatum dedit.

[6] *Ibid.*, 260: epicurus episcopus iam plane laetissimus, Benedictus inquit, domino Deo sodes meus dilectissimus, benedicta munera eius! Revera decus est Wirzeburgensium presulum. Sapiens imperator nusquam melius collocare poterat hunc optimum episcopatum.

[7] *Ibid.*: Sic homo erat: cum nuper maxime fervebat, paulo post tam placidus ut ovis fiebat. Denique cum aliquando durius in aliquem saeviret inpransus, post mensam flebiliter se ipsum accusabat, dicens se propter ventris sui impatientiam innocuam sancti Willibaldi lacerasse familiam.

[8] *Anon. Haser*, c. 19, *MGH, SS* VII, 258: Solebat quoque nonnunquam facile maledicere, verum absque ulla fellis ameritudine.

[9] *Ibid.*

that the name be changed to Essolf.[10] It will be readily understood that such a period as Lent was terribly trying for Megingaud. It seemed to him longer than a year. On Sundays in Lent the lateness of the dinner hour was a matter of special concern to him. As an incentive to his chapter to speed through the services, he had placed before them in the middle of the choir, as they were singing primes, a delectable *pièce de résistance*, a good-sized fish.[11] But at all times Megingaud was a lover of simplicity and brevity as applied to church services, though not to meals.[12] Indeed, brevity in the one he found conducive to length in the other. At Easter masses he became excessively annoyed as the precentor in solemn fashion was going through the interminable sequences. Rather than wait their conclusion he instructed the archdeacon to read the gospel as soon as possible. The choir with their foolishness were killing him with the pangs of hunger and thirst. And so, in the time taken to complete the sequences, several masses pleasing to God were sung.[13]

In consecrating oil and in consecrating churches Megingaud preferred the simplicity of earlier times. Likewise, he made short work of the sacrament of ordination, protesting also when too many candidates presented themselves at once. Nor need the sacrament be performed in a church; he could consecrate them just as well in the depth of a forest of Würz-

[10] *Anon. Haser.*, c. 16, *MGH, SS* VII, 258: . . . de Vastolfo Haserensi narravi, quam in confirmatione Ezzolfum iussit nominari. Ipse libentissime manducavit, ideoque nomen a ieiunio ductum sibi displicuit.

[11] *Ibid.*, c. 17, 258: Per singulas enim quadragesimales dominicas, cum prima cantaretur, husonem magnum in medio choro iussit extendere.

[12] *Anon. Haser*, c. 17, *MGH, SS* VII, 258: Erat autem in omni divino servitio amator brevitatis semperque malebat missam brevem quam mensam.

[13] *Ibid.*: Iratus episcopus vocat archidiaconum, iussitque eum quantocius legere ewangelium: Illi, inquit, insaniunt et nimium diu cantando fame et siti me occidunt. Stulte! Antequam fierent sequentiae, plures Deo placitae cantatae sunt missae.

burg, where he was probably hunting.[14] He was not, however, entirely indifferent to canonical prescriptions. A smart young cleric of Würzburg, who came riding to him on a mission with a falcon on his wrist, he slapped in the face several times with his own falcon.[15] Not even at court did Megingaud attempt to overcome his disinclination to observe strictly formal rules. He was accustomed, in case the way was muddy, to ride straight to the entrance of the king's private quarters. What indeed was a horse for? Why should he, just because of foolish formalities, approach on foot like a serf, with his good clothes covered with mud? As for rising when the emperor made his appearance, this was to belie everything that he had been taught: he was the king's elder kinsman, and scripture and good manners alike enjoined respect for age.[16] A royal messenger that stopped at Eichstätt demanding food, when as a matter of fact he had plenty with him, got a whipping, even though a meal had to be interrupted to supply it.[17]

Unhappily we know no other bishop like Megingaud. His successor Gundekar enjoyed hunting to excess.[18] Thieddag of

[14] *Anon. Haser.*, c. 18, *MGH, SS* VII, 258: Crede mihi, hisce oculis vidi nonnullos venerabiles presbiteros, qui veraciter professi sunt se ab illo in Wirzburgensi nemore consecratos.

[15] *Anon. Haser*, c. 21, *MGH, SS* VII, 259: At ille apprehensum per liguras accipitrem ter et quater in faciem clerici percussit.

[16] *Ibid.*, c. 24, 260: O stulti, egone deberem propter inanes facetias vestras quasi vile mancipium luto aspergi? Quid mihi equus caballus, si ad curiam venirem viator lutosus? . . . Ego, inquiens, senior sum cognatus, et seniorem honorare tam gentiles quam sacrae iubent litterae.

For Megingaud's attitude towards Henry II, cf. ch. II, pp. 47-48.

[17] *Ibid.*, c. 20, 259: Quippe inter prandendum, cum didicisset episcopus quod cibaria non pauca secum ferret, abstractum de mensa loris aggredi iussit, et oblito domesticatus consortio mendacium oris dorso infligi precepit.

See ch. II, pp. 89-90, for the reception given to another royal messenger demanding *servitum*.

[18] *Ibid.*, c. 25, 261: Nam quia venationibus ultra modum deditus erat, regalem curiam . . . Nordelingen (Nördlingen) dictam Ratisponensi episcopo pro venatione quadam . . . prope Ungariam sita delegavit: de qua venatione omnes post eum episcopi ne unius quidem oboli pretium habuerunt.

Prague, although he was a good physician, drank to excess.[19] But he was a sick man, a paralytic in fact, and needed drink and the good company that he invited or compelled to share with him his solace. Thietmar piously expresses the hope that he applied his medicaments to the curing of his soul.[20] Wolboldo of Liège was a huge man who needed twice as much food as the ordinary person, though he did not indulge himself.[21] At the fopperies of bishop Gebehard of Regensburg Thietmar was simply dumbfounded: he had never seen or heard the like of such manners and dress.[22] In their relations with women it is astonishing to find how very little except gossip, and how little even of that, is laid to the charge of

---

[19] The bishops of Hildesheim were noted physicians, especially Wigbert and Bernward; cf. Bertram, I, 47; Lüntzel, I, 129 ff.

[20] Thiet., VIII, 56 (Kurze, 227): medicinali arte optime instructus est . . . hospites . . . non solum ad se invitavit sed etiam traxit, hoc maximum habens vitium, quod ob morbum sibi innocentem bibebat supra modum. Paraliticus enim erat, manuum tremore assiduo sine asstantium auxilio presbiterorum missam canere non potuit: sicque usque ad finem languescens bonis, ut spero, animam curabat medicaminibus.

[21] Anselm, *Gesta epp. Leod.*, c. 33, *MGH, SS* VII, 207: corpus suum tali magnitudine vastum . . . longe citra saturitatem reficiebat. Unni of Hamburg-Bremen was a little man (parvulo Unni, *Adam Bremensis*, I, c. 54 (Schmeidler, 55)) as were Bernward of Hildesheim and Willigis of Mainz (Böhmer, 166 f.). Wigbert of Merseburg was tall and handsome (Thiet., VI, 36 [Kurze, 155]: egreius et statura et facie) and Adaldag of Hamburg-Bremen was good-looking (*Adam Bremensis*, II, c. 1 (Schmeidler, 61): decorus specie). Poor Thietmar had to confess himself a poor little excuse for a man, with a broken nose and a lopsided jaw defaced by a fistula (IV, 51, *MGH, SS* III, 789): videbis in me parvum homuntionem. . . . Nasus in puericia fractus ridiculum de me facit . . . maxilla deformem leva, et latere eodem, quia hinc olim erupit semper turgescens fistula.

[22] Thiet., VI, 41 (Kurze, 158): Hoc solum scio, quod moribus et raris apparatibus huic similem numquam vidi neque de antiquioribus audivi. *Herimanni Aug. Chron.*, 1023, *MGH, SS* V, 120: singularibus quibusdam moribus et munditiarum ornatusque insueto quodam amore famosum et in divinis officiis nimis studiosum.

these tenth century bishops, although their other faults are certainly not passed over in silence.[23]

In the main our episcopal biographers would have us believe that, except for the sake of politeness to guests or on great church holidays, their heroes were not only very moderate but even ascetic in their eating and drinking and dressing. There is little if any reason to gainsay them. The least that may be said of almost all of them would be that, like the abbot John of Gorze, they were rarely if ever drunk,[24] and they were in no sense gourmands. They were generous with their hospitality and jovial hosts.[25] It was indeed regarded as unbecoming and disgraceful to be other than generous,[26] and of course generosity paid, even, as Unwan of

[23] Odalbert of Salzburg and Erkanbald of Mainz were married men before assuming ecclesiastical office. The criticism of Abraham of Freising and Judith has already been referred to in ch. II, n. 44. Perhaps we may fairly read the following passage as an insinuation on the part of a Hildesheim partisan that the Gandersheim nuns (see chapter II, p. 54) ran away to Mainz in order to be too close to Aribo (although the implication of the ablative absolutes is certainly far from clear): *Vita Godehardi prior*, c. 29, *MGH, SS* XI, 188: ad Aribonem . . . tota animi intentione fugerunt, adeo ut ad ipsum convivendi gratia sepius commearent, cum ipsoque aliquandiu familiarius commanerent, domna Sophia id totum consentiente, nil sane periculosum inde suspicante. Balderich of Liège was said to be uxorious (Gerdes, *Bischofswahlen*, 12, n. 1).

[24] *Vita Joh. Gorz.*, c. 94, *MGH, SS* IV, 364: ut vix aut nunquam in ebrietatem aut crapulam . . . deduceretur. Cf. *Vita Oudal.*, c. 3, *MGH, SS* IV, 390; *Libel. de consuet. Willig.*, c. 2, *MGH, SS* XV, 744; *Vita Burchardi*, c. 20, *MGH, SS* IV, 844; *Vita Godehardi prior*, c. 39, *MGH, SS* XI, 196; *Vita Bernwardi*, c. 5, *MGH, SS* IV, 759-760.

[25] *Vita Oudal.*, c. 3, *MGH, SS* IV, 390: Hospites autem cum ad eum devenissent, tripudio et tanta hilaritate vultus et animi suscepti sunt et in omnibus procurati, veluti eis optime conveniebat, sciens in eis Christum se suscepisse, illo dicente: Hospes fui et suscepistis me; c. 28, 418, of bishop Henry: Herili servicio ad mensam suam utebatur, et cum eo manentibus copiam manducandi atque bibendi hilari vultu et placida mente porrexit.

[26] Thietmar to his successor: IX, 13 (Kurze, 247): Non rogo te ut sis parcus, quia dedecus est; sed hoc ingemino, ne nimium largus, quia [hoc] nec consilium est nec bene convenit.

Hamburg-Bremen learned, when dealing with Scandinavian kings.[27] For the most part the bishop enjoyed the pomp of festivals and liked to dress up for the occasion.[28] Unwan was one of these; at Easter he wished to crowd all the nobility of his province into his court.[29] Udalrich's Easter dinner was enjoyed to the accompaniment of music from an orchestra, the members of which standing in line stretched across almost the whole length of the hall.[30] Perhaps the adjectives most commonly applied to these bishops are *affabilis* and *hilaris*. Of course there were bishops who did not go in for many "episcopal delicacies,"[31] men like Bruno who were only *modicum hilaris*.[32]

For all that, to the impatience and disgust of his admirers, Bruno was not spared criticism for his preoccupation with secular affairs.[33] His nephew, William of Mainz, complained

[27] *Adam Bremensis*, II, 50 (Schmeidler, 111): ut ferocissimos reges aquilonis hylaritate suorum munerum ad omnia quae voluit benignos obedientesque haberet.

[28] *Vita Oudal.*, c. 4, *MGH*, *SS* IV, 392: ipse suo more gloriosissime ad Dei servicium paratus.

[29] Dehio, I, 162; Hauck, III, 637 ff.

[30] *Vita Oudal.*, c. 4, *MGH*, *SS* IV, 393: Tempore enim statuto symphoniaci venerunt, quorum tam copiosa multitudo fuit ut pene intercopedinem aulae secundum ordinem stando implevissent, et tres modos symphonizando perfecerunt. His ita gaudiis multiplicatis . . .

[31] *Vita Bernwardi*, c. 1, *MGH*, *SS* IV, 759: episcopales delicias.

[32] *Vita Brunonis*, c. 12 (Pertz, 14). Cf. c. 30 (30): Molles et delicatas vestes . . . declinavit. . . . Lectuli delicias vehementer aspernatus est; c. 21 (23): instituit . . . ut vestium superfluitas, morum inaequalitas, et quicquid hoc modo effeminatum et indecens in eius aecclesia videretur, vera et spirituali circumcisione . . . diligentissime abscideretur. Cf. Chapter VIII, n. 16.

[33] *Ibid.*, c. 23 (23): Causantur forte aliqui divinae dispensationis ignari quare episcopus rem populi et pericula belli tractaverit, cum animarum tantum modo curam susceperit. Quibus res ipsa facile, si quid sanum sapiunt, satisfacit, cum tantum et tam insuetum illis praesertim partibus pacis bonum per hunc tutorem et doctorem fidelis populi longe lateque propagatum aspiciunt. . . . Nec vero nova fuit huius mundi gubernatio aut sanctae Dei aecclesiae rectoribus antea inusitata; cuius exempla si quis requisierit in promptu sunt. Nos vero ad alia festinantes, quid quisque de pio viro loquatur,

to Rome of the utter lack of distinction between secular and ecclesiastical matters, with special reference to Bruno: duke and count arrogate to themselves the functions of bishop, bishops the functions of duke and count.[34] Bernward of Hildesheim aroused envy and indignation because of his devotion to Otto III,[35] and a later reviser of his biography felt called upon to justify his preoccupation with military affairs,[36] Lantbert, the author of the life of Heribert of Cologne, forbears to record the participation of Heribert in Italian affairs, since that was to write political history, which had nothing to do with the praise of a saint.[37] But this undercurrent of criticism and dissatisfaction with the secular rôle of the higher clergy seems to have been small in volume and harmless in effect. The union of the two spheres of activity in the person of the bishop generally seemed wholly natural and justifiable from scripture. What, indeed, were secular activities? Land administration was simply carrying out the behest, "Feed my sheep," a mere necessity for the shepherd of the flock. Service to the king and the state was only rendering unto Caesar the things that were Caesar's.[38] Capacity for secular as well as ecclesiastical affairs was recognized as essential in the qualifications for episcopal office.[39]

---

suo ipsius iudicio relinquimus; scientes sani capitis esse neminem qui bonum evidentissimum ullo maledicti obprobio fuscare nitatur. Cf. Widukind, I, 31 (Kehr, 38): Ac ne quis eum culpabilem super hoc dixerit, cum Samuelem sanctum et alios plures sacerdotes pariter legamus et iudices.

[34] Jaffé, *BRG*, III, 348: Dux comesque episcopi, episcopus ducis comitisque sibi operam vindicat.

[35] *Vita Bernwardi*, c. 6, *MGH, SS* IV, 760: Unde et multorum invidiam in se commovebat, qui indignabantur illum vigilantiori studio rei publicae negocia obire. Cf. ch. VI, n. 2 (7).

[36] See Lüntzel, I, 141, n. 2.

[37] *Vita Heriberti*, c. 4, *MGH, SS* IV, 742: Quotiens cum imperatore Romam ierit et redierit, utque augustus arcem imperii, res Italiae moderando, disposuerit, potius regiae videtur inscribendum chronicae quam in laudem sancti violenter inflectere.

[38] Böhmer, 118, n. 10. Cf. also Chapter II, n. 215, last paragraph.

[39] *Gesta epp. Camerac.*, c. 66, *MGH, SS* VII, 424: vir tam aecclesiasticis quam secularibus disciplinis sufficienter instructus; c. 89, 433:

The bishop who possessed the former without the latter was actually less likely to be an anomaly in the tenth century than the bishop who shone only by his piety. Although several of the bishops of whom we have spoken so often were canonized, the pure saint just did not fit in a tenth century see.

No matter how great their secular activities may have been, the charge of neglecting their spiritual duties cannot in fact be brought against these German bishops. It is just this unwillingness to sacrifice the one for the other side of their activity that gives to us, as we read their lives, the impression that they were always rushed. They had so much to do that they could not always do it. Adalgar of Hamburg-Bremen, as he got too old to take care of all his affairs, had to have help.[40] Udalrich of Augsburg had to turn over the secular affairs of the bishopric to his nephew.[41] Indeed, it is not infrequently that we are told that the bishop was in the habit of doing this or that if he had time or if nothing else interfered.[42] It is characteristic, for example, that along with their imperial service in Italy they never lost an opportunity

---

vir videlicet tam secularibus quam aecclesiasticis disciplinis satis imbutus; c. 110, 448: tam et aecclesiasticis quam secularibus negotiis eruditus. Thiet., I, 6 (Kurze, 5): vir ingeniosus omnigenarumque quae spiritualia vel etiam carnalia respicit arcium scientia . . . excellens. *Vita Godehardi prior*, c. 16, *MGH*, *SS* XI, 179: in divinis humanisque per omne vitae suae tempus . . . studiosus.

[40] *Adam Bremensis*, I, c. 50 (Schmeidler, 50): Archiepiscopus noster, valde senex, minus poterat vel inimicis resistere vel agenda disponere. Quare ferunt illum . . . suscepisse adiutorium. . . . Ad hoc quia senectutis pondere gravatus . . . pastorale officium non poterat . . . dati sunt ei adiutores.

[41] *Vita Oudal.*, c. 3, *MGH*, *SS* IV, 389: ut praefatus Adalbero in eius vice itinera hostilia cum milicia episcopali in voluntatem imperatoris perageret et in curte imperatoris eius vice assiduitate servitii moraretur, ea videlicet causa, ut prefato praesuli Dei servicio et custodiae gregis commendati et utilitatibus aecclesiae et orationibus et elemosinis secundum suum desiderium immorari licuisset. Cf. Ch. II, n. 185.

[42] *Ibid.*: quandocumque ei domi manendum aliae occupationes consenserunt; c. 14, 403: si alia aliqua ei occupatio vel absentia impedimentum non fecit. Cf. ch. VI, pp. 200-201, and n. 32.

to acquire desirable relics for their sees, even though the means they employed frequently lacked piety, and even common honesty, except such piety or honesty as pious motives may lend to force, deceit and theft.[43] If one attempts to conceive as a whole the activity of the individual bishop in the tenth and early eleventh centuries, one is forced to the conclusion that it was too much for any one man. Most of the burden of civilization rested upon the shoulders of these bishops. No wonder that they felt the need sometimes to retire from the rush of life. Notger of Liège was fond of seeking quiet in the canonry of St. John at Liège, and Burchard built himself an oratory in the verdant shelter of a wood near Worms.[44]

[43] Fulbert of Cambrai, while unable to refuse to Otto I for the new see of Magdeburg the relics of St. Gaugericus and St. Aubert, was so loathe to lose them that he compromised with his conscience by making an unsuspected substitution (*Gesta epp. Camerac.*, I, c. 78, *MGH, SS* VII, 430). Cf. Dümmler, 475, for Dietrich of Metz: der halb mit Gewalt, halb mit List den italienischen Bischöfen ihre kostbaren Reliquien abwendig zu machen fortfuhr. Cf. Lüntzel, I, 46-49, for the nocturnal robbery of the grave of St. Epiphanius at Pavia, arranged by Othwin of Hildesheim (*Translatio S. Epiphanii, MGH, SS* IV, 248-251).

[44] *Vita Notgeri*, c. 9 (Kurth, II, 14): Quando ergo a majoribus negotiis ad quietem evadere poterat ad Sanctum Johannem se conferebat. Burchard (*Vita Burchardi*, c. 10, *MGH, SS* IV, 837) built his oratory: quia mundanos tumultus devitare voluit. . . . Illic se post concilia regiaque colloquia et post curam synodalem diversosque mundi strepitus receperat; ibique negociis secularibus post tergum proiectis, totis viribus in obsequio Dei studebat.

APPENDIX

List of Ottonian Bishops, 919-1024 [1]

I. The Archbishopric of Mainz

1. Mainz	
Heriger	913-927
Hildebert	927-937
Frederick	937-954
William	954-968
Hatto II	968-970
Ruotbert	970-975
Willigis	975-1011
Erkanbald	1011-1021
Aribo	1021-1031
2. Augsburg	
Hiltin	909-923
Udalrich	923-973
Henry	973-982
Etich	982-988
Liudolf	989-996
Gebehard	996-1000
Siegfrid	1000-1006
Bruno	1006-1029
3. Bamberg	
Eberhard	1007-1040
4. Chur	
Waldo	after 913-949
Hartbert	949-after 966
Hiltebold	before Jan, 2 976-after Oct 20, 988
Waldo II	
Udalrich	1002, or before-1024, or after
5. Eichstätt	
Starchand	933-966
Reginald	966-988 or 9
Megingaud	989 or 90-1014
Gundekar	1014-1019
Walter	1019-1021
Heribert	1021 or 2-1042
6. Halberstadt	
Bernhard	924-968
Hildeward	968-996
Arnulf	996-1023
Branthog	1023-1036
7. Hildesheim	
Sehard	919-928
Thiedhard	928-954
Othwin	954-984
Osdag	985-989
Gerdag	990-992
Bernward	992-1022
Godehard	1022-1038
8. Constance	
Noting	921-934
Conrad	934-975
Gamenolf	975-979
Gebehard II	979-995
Landbert	995-1018
Rudhard	1018-1022
Heimo	1022-1026
9. Paderborn	
Unwan	917-935
Dudo	935-960
Folcmar	961-983
Rethar	983-1009
Meinwerk	1009-1036
10. Prague	
Deothmar	976-983
Adalbert	983-997
Thieddag	997-1017
Ekkehard	1017-1023
Hizo	1023-1030
11. Speyer	
Bernhard	918-
Amalrich	d. 941
Reginbald	941-949
Godefrid	950-961

[1] Based on Hauck, III (1920), 981-1011; all spellings have been made uniform with those used in the text and footnotes above if the bishop has been referred to.

11. Speyer (continued)

Otger	961-970
Balderich	970-986
Ruotbert	986-1004
Walter	1004-1027

12. Strassburg

Richwin	before 916-933
Rothard	before 939-950
Udo	950-965
Erkanbald	965-991
Widerolf	991 or 2 (?)-999
Alewich	1000-1001
Werinher	1001-1028

13. Verden

Adalward	916-933
Amelung	before Sept. 21, 937-962
Bruno	962-976
Erp	976-994
Bernhard	994-1014
Wicher	1014-1031

14. Worms

Richowo	914-949 or 50
Anno	950-979
Hildebald	979-998
Franko	998-999
Erfo	999
Razo	999
Burchard	1000-1025

15. Würzburg

Burchard II	931 or 2-941
Poppo I	941-961
Poppo II	961-983
Huc	983 or 4-990
Brunward	990-995
Henry	995 or 6-1018
Meginhard	1019-1034

II. Archbishopric of Cologne

1. Cologne

Wicfrid	923 or 4-953
Bruno	953-965
Folcmar	965-967
Gero	969-975
Warin	975-985
Everger	985-999
Heribert	999-1021
Pilgrim	1021-1036

2. Liège

Richar	922-945
Ougo	945-947
Farabert	947-953
Rather	953-955
Balderich	955-959
Everarchar	959-971
Notger	972-1008
Baldrich II	1008-1018
Wolboldo	1018-1021
Durand	1021-1025

3. Minden

Liuthar	941(?)-927
Evergis	927(?)-958
Lantward	958(?)-969
Milo	969(?)-996
Ramward	996(?)-1002
Thiedrich II	before March 13, 1003-1022
Sigibert	1022-1036

4. Münster

Rumald	922(?)-
Hildebold	947(?)-969
Duodo	969(?)-993
Swithger	993 or 4-1011
Thiedrich	1011-1022
Siegfrid	1022-1032

5. Osnabrück

Dodo	before Nov. 7, 921-949
Drogo	949 or 50-967

5. Osnabrück (continued)

Liudolf	967-978
Dodo II	978(?)-996
Gunther	996-998
Othiluf	998(?)-1003
Thietmar	1003-1023
Meginher	before July 27, 1023-1027

6. Utrecht

Balderich	918-975
Folcmar	after June 8, 976-991
Baldewin	991(?)-995
Ansfrid	995-1000
Adalbold	1010-1026

III. Archbishopric of Trier

1. Trier

Ruotbert	931-956
Henry	956-964
Dietrich	before June 2, 965-977
Ekbert	977-993
Liudolf	994-1008
Megingaud	1008-1015
Poppo	1016-1047

2. Metz

Wigerich	917-927
Benno	927-929
Adalbero	929-962
Dietrich I	965-984
Adalbero II	984-1005
Dietrich II	1006-1047
Adalbero III	1047-1072

3. Toul

Gauzlin	922-962
Gerard	963-994
Stephan	994-996
Berthold	996-1019
Herman	1019-1026

4. Verdun

Hugo	923-925
Bernain	925-939
Berengar	940-959
Wicfrid	959 or 60-984
Adalbero I	984
Adalbero II	984-988
Heimo	988-1024

IV. Archbishopric of Salzburg

1. Salzburg

Odalbert	923-935
Egilolf	935-939
Harold	before May 29, 940-958
Frederick	958-991
Hartwich	991-1023
Gunther	1024-1025

2. Brixen (Seben)

Nithard	
Wisund	
Rihpert	before 967-
Albuin	before 977-
	1005 or 6
Adalbero	before Nov. 1, 1007-
Herward	before April 24, 1020-
Hardwig	1027 or before-

3. Freising

Wolfram	926(?)-937
Lantbert	937-957
Abraham	957-993
Gottschalk	993-1005
Egilbert	1005-1039

4. Passau

Gundbolt	914-930
Gerhard	before Jan. 14, 932-946
Adalbert	946-971
Pilgrim	971-991
Christian	991-1013
Berengar	1013-1045

5. Regensburg
   - Isimgrim 930-940
   - Gunther 940
   - Michael 940 or 1-972
   - Wolfgang 972-994
   - Gebehard I 994-1023
   - Gebehard II 1023-1036

V. Archbishopric of Hamburg-Bremen

1. Hamburg-Bremen
   - Unni 918-936
   - Adaldag 937-988
   - Liäwizo 988-1013
   - Unwan 1013-1029
   - Folcward 990-
   - Reginbert 992-
   - Bernhard 1013 or 4-1023
   - Reinhold 1023-1032(?)
2. Mecklenburg
   - Reginbert before 992-
   - Bernhard -1023
3. Oldenburg
   - Egward 968-
   - Wago before 988-
   - Eziko before 988-
4. Schleswig
   - Hored 947-before 973
   - Marco before 973-
   - Adaldag
   - Folgbert before 988-
   - Poppo before 995-
   - Ekkehard before autumn of 1000-1026

VI. Archbishopric of Magdeburg

1. Magdeburg
   - Adalbert 968-981
   - Giseler 981-1004
   - Tagino 1004-1012
   - Walter 1012-
   - Gero 1012-1023
2. Brandenburg
   - Thietmar 949-967(?)
   - Dodilo 965 or 8-980
   - Folcmar -983
   - Wigo before Feb. 6, 1004-after Feb. 22, 1017
   - Ezilo
   - Liuzo before 1023-
3. Havelburg
   - Dudo 947-
   - Hilderich after 981-1008
   - Erich 1008-after 1028
4. Meissen
   - Burchard 968-969
   - Volkold 969-992
   - Eid 992-1015
   - Eilward 1016-1022
   - Huprecht 1023-1024
5. Merseburg
   - Boso 968-970
   - Giseler 971-981
   - Wigbert 1004-1009
   - Thietmar 1009-1018
   - Bruno -1036
6. Zeitz-Naumburg
   - Hug I 968-979
   - Frederick I before 981-
   - Hugo II -after 1002
   - Hildeward before 1004-1030

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Bibliography and Historiography

E. Dahlmann, G. Waitz, *Quellenkunde der deutschen Geschichte.* Unter Mitwirkung von Ernst Baasch, Adolf Bachmann, u.a. Leipzig, 1912.

Jahresberichte für deutsche Geschichte, 1. 2. 3. 4. Jahrgang, 1925, 1926. 1927, 1928. Herausgegeben von Albert Brackmann und Fritz Hartung. Leipzig, 1927, 1928, 1929, 1930.

M. Jansen, L. Schmitz-Kallenberg, *Historiographie und Quellen der deutschen Geschichte bis 1500.* 2. Auflage. Grundriss der Geschichtswissenschaft, Reihe I, Abtlg. 7. Leipzig, Berlin, 1914.

A. Potthast, *Bibliotheca historica medii aevi. Wegweiser durch die Geschichtswerke des europäischen Mittelalters bis 1300.* Berlin. 1896.

W. Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter.* 6. Auflage. I. II. Band. Berlin, 1893-1894.

II. Sources

P. Jaffé, *Bibliotheca rerum Germanicarum.* T. 3, *Monumenta Moguntina,* Berlin, 1866. T. 5, *Monumenta Bambergensia,* Berlin, 1869.

Fontes rerum Austriacarum, Oesterreichische Geschichtsquellen. Herausgegeben von der Historischen Kommission der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Wien, 1855 ff.

Mansi, Gian D., ed. *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio.* 31 v. Florentiae, Venetiis, 1759-1798.

Monumenta Boica. Edidit Academ. Scientiar. Elect. (Königliche Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften). Munich, 1763-1916.

Regesta pontificum Romanorum ab condita ecclesia ad annum post Christum natum MCXCVIII. Edidit Philippus Jaffé. Editionem secundam et auctam auspiciis Guglielmi Wattenbach . . . curaverunt S. Loewenfeld et al. Lipsiae, 1885-1888.

Monumenta Germaniae Historica inde ab anno Christi quingentesimo usque ad annum millesimum et quingentesimum auspiciis Societatis aperiendis fontibus rerum Germanicarum medii aevi edidit Georgius Heinricus Pertz.

Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum.

Tomus I. Hannoverae, MDCCCLXXXV.

Gregorii episcopi Turonensis historia Francorum, pp. 1-451.

Epistolae Merovingici et Karolini aevi. Tomus I. Berolini, MDCCCXCII.

Poetae Latini aevi Carolini. Tomus IV. Recensuit Paulus de Winterfeld. Berolini, MDCCCXCIX.

Diplomata regum et imperatorum Germaniae.

Tomus I. Hannoverae, MDCCCLXXIX-MDCCCLXXXIV.
Conradi I, Heinrici I et Ottonis I diplomata.
Tomus II. Hannoverae, MDCCCLXXXXIII.
Ottonis II et III diplomata.
Tomus III. Hannoverae, MDCCCC-MDCCCCIII.
Heinrici II et Arduini diplomata.
Capitularia regum Francorum.
Tomus I. Denuo edidit Alfredus Boretius. Hannoverae, MDCCCLXXXI.
Tomus II. Denuo ediderunt Alfredus Boretius et Victor Krause. Hannoverae, MDCCCXCVII.
Concilia.
Tomi I, II. Edidit Societas aperiendis fontibus rerum Germanicarum medii aevi. Hannoverae, MDCCCLXXXXIII.
Constitutiones et Acta Publica imperatorum et regum.
Tomus I. Edidit Ludewicus Weiland. Hannoverae, MDCCCXCIII.
Leges.
Tomus II. Hannoverae, MDCCCXXXVII.
Synodus Altheimensis, pp. 554-560.
Scriptores rerum Germanicarum.
Tomus I. Hannoverae, MDCCCXXVI.
Annales Alamannici. Continuatio Sangallensis tertia a. 882-912 et 926, pp. 52-60.
Tomus II. Hannoverae, MDCCCXXVIII.
Ekkehardi IV. casuum S. Galli continuatio I, pp. 74-147.
Einhardi vita Karoli imperatoris, pp. 426-463.
Thegani vita Hludowici imperatoris, pp. 585-604.
Tomus III. Hannoverae, MDCCCXXXVIII.
Liudprandi antapodoseos, pp. 273-339.
Liudprandi historia Ottonis, pp. 340-346.
Flodoardi annales, pp. 363-407.
Widukindi res gestae Saxonicae, edente D. Georgio Waitz, pp. 408-467.
Tomus IV. Hannoverae, MDCCCXLI.
Gesta episcoporum Virdunensium, edente D. Georgio Waitz, pp. 36-51.
Vita Iohannis abbatis Gorziensis auctore Iohanne abbate S. Arnulfi, pp. 335-377.
Gerhardi vita S. Oudalrici episcopi Augustani, pp. 377-428.
Ex Hartmanni vita S. Wiboradae, pp. 452-457.
Ex miraculis S. Verenae, pp. 457-460.
Othloni vita S. Wolfkangi episcopi, pp. 521-542.
Ex Arnoldi libris de S. Emmerammo, pp. 543-574.

Vita Adalberonis II. Mettensis episcopi auctore Constantino abbate, pp. 658-672.
Vita Heinrici II imperatoris auctore Adalboldo, edente D. Georgio Waitz, pp. 679-695.
Alperti opera. De diversitate temporum libri II, pp. 700-723.
Vita Balderici episcopi Leodiensis, pp. 724-738.
Vita Heriberti archiepiscopi Coloniensis, pp. 739-753.
Vita Bernwardi episcopi Hildesheimensis, pp. 754-782.
Vita Burchardi episcopi Wormatiensis, pp. 829-846.

Tomus V. Hannoverae, MDCCCXLIII.
Herimanni Augiensis Chronicon, pp. 67-133.

Tomus VII. Hannoverae, MDCCCXLVI.
Anselmi gesta episcoporum . . . Leodiensium, pp. 184-234.
Anonymus Haserensis de episcopis Eichstetensibus, pp. 235-266.
Gesta episcoporum Cameraciensium, pp. 402-489.

Tomus VIII. Hannoverae, MDCCCXLVIII.
Gesta Treverorum, edente G. Waitz, pp. 111-260.
Ruperti chronica Sancti Laurentii Leodiensis, ed. W. Wattenbach, pp. 261-279.

Tomus X. Hannoverae, MDCCCLII.
Gesta episcoporum Mettensium, edente D. G. Waitz, pp. 531-551.

Tomus XI. Hannoverae, MDCCCLIIII.
Vita Meinwerci episcopi Patherbrunnensis, pp. 104-161.
Vita Godehardi episcopi Hildesheimensis prior, pp. 167-196.
Vita Godehardi episcopi posterior, pp. 196-218.
Historiae Farfenses. Hugonis opuscula, pp. 530-544.
Benzonis episcopi Alhensis ad Henricum IV. imp. libri VII, ed. K. Pertz, pp. 591-681.

Tomus XIV. Hannoverae, MDCCCLXXXIII.
Gesta archiepiscoporum Magdeburgensium, ed. Guill. Schum, pp. 361-484.
Monumenta historiae Lobiensis, pp. 543-556.

Tomus XV, Pars II. Hannoverae, MDCCCLXXXVIII.
Brunonis vita quinque fratrum, ed. R. Kode, pp. 709-738.
Libellus de Willigisi . . . consuetudinibus, pp. 742-745.

Tomus XVI. Hannoverae, MDCCCLVIIII.
Annales Magdeburgenses, pp. 105-196.

Tomus XXI. Hannoverae, MDCCCLXVIIII.
Helmoldi presbyteri chronica Slavorum, edente I. M. Lappenberg, pp. 1-99.

Tomus XXV. Hannoverae, MDCCCLXXX.
Aegidii Aureaevallensis gesta episcoporum Leodiensium, ed. I. Heller, pp. 1-129.

Tomus XXVII. Hannoverae, MDCCCLXXXV.
Ex annalibus Burtonensibus, pp. 473-484.

Adam von Bremen, *Hamburgische Kirchengeschichte.* 3. Auflage. Herausgegeben von Bernhard Schmeidler. Hannover, Leipzig, 1917.

Reginonis abbatis Prumiensis chronicon cum continuatione Treverensi. Recognovit Fridericus Kurze. Hannover, 1890.

Ruotgeri vita Brunonis archiepiscopi Coloniensis. Edidit Georgius Heinricus Pertz. Hannoverae, 1841.

Thietmar Merseburgensis episcopi chronicon. Post editionem Joh. M. Lappenbergii recognovit Fridericus Kurze. Hannoverae, 1899.

Widukindi rerum gestarum Saxonicarum libri tres. Editio quarta. Post Georgium Waitz recognovit Karolus Andreas Kehr. Hannoverae et Lipsiae, 1904.

Translations

Adam von Bremen, Hamburgische Kirchengeschichte. Nach der Ausgabe der *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum* unter Mitarbeit von Bernhard Schmeidler neubearbeitet von Sigfrid Steinberg. Die Geschichtsschreiber der deutschen Vorzeit, 2. Gesamtausgabe . . . Band 44. Leipzig, 1926.

Die Geschichtsschreiber der deutschen Vorzeit in deutscher Bearbeitung, X. XI. Jahrhundert. Berlin, 1857 ff.

The History of the Franks by Gregory of Tours. Translated with an introduction by O. M. Dalton. Vol. I, Introduction; Vol. II, Text. Oxford, 1927.

The Life of Bishop Meinwerk, by H. C. Engelbrecht. A dissertation submitted . . . in candidacy for the degree of Master of Arts. Ms., University of Chicago Library, 1918.

The Works of Liudprand of Cremona. Translated by F. A. Wright. Broadway Medieval Library, London, 1930.

III. Secondary Works

P. S. Allen, *The Romanesque Lyric. Studies in its background and development from Petronius to the Cambridge songs, 50-1050.* With renderings into English verse by Howard Mumford Jones. Chapel Hill, 1928.

Allgemeine deutsche Biographie. Herausgegeben durch die Historische Commission bei der königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften (zu München). 56 Bd. Leipzig, 1775-1912.

H. Aubin, T. Frings, u.a. *Geschichte des Rheinlandes von der ältesten Zeit bis zur Gegenwart.* I. Band, W. Levison, *Politische Geschichte.* Essen an der Ruhr, 1922.

A. Barth, *Das bischöfliche Beamtentum im Mittelalter, vornehmlich in den Diözesen Halberstadt, Hildesheim, Magdeburg und Merseburg.* Inaug. Diss . . . Göttingen. Wernigerode, 1900.

G. von Below, *Die italienische Kaiserpolitik des deutschen Mittelalters, mit besonderem Hinblick auf die Politik Friedrich Barbarossas.* Beiheft 10 der Historischen Zeitschrift. München und Berlin, 1927.

A. Bertram, *Geschichte des Bisthums Hildesheim.* 1. Band. Hildesheim, 1899.

H. Böhmer, *Willigis von Mainz. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des deutschen Reichs und der deutschen Kirche in der sächsischen Kaiserzeit.* Leipziger Studien aus dem Gebiet der Geschichte, 1. Band, 3. Heft. Leipzig, 1895.

J. F. Böhmer, *Die Urkunden der römischen Könige und Kaiser von Conrad I bis Heinrich VII, 911-1313.* Frankfurt am Main, 1831.

R. Boerger, *Die Belehnungen der deutschen geistlichen Fürsten.* Leipziger Studien aus dem Gebiet der Geschichte, 8. Band, 3. Heft. Leipzig, 1901.

H. Boos, *Geschichte der rheinischen Städtekultur von ihren Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Stadt Worms.* 1. Band. 2. Auflage. Berlin, 1897.

The Cambridge Medieval History. Planned by J. B. Bury, M.A.; edited by H. M. Gwatkin, M.A., et al. New York.

Vol. I, *The Christian Roman Empire and the Foundation of the Teutonic Kingdom.* 1911.

Vol. II, *The Rise of the Saracens and the Foundation of the Western Empire.* 1913.

Vol. IV, *Germany and the Western Empire.* 1922.

H. Casparis, *Der Bischof von Chur als Grundherr in Mittelalter.* Abhandlungen zum schweizerischen Recht, 38. Heft. Bern, 1910.

G. Dehio, *Geschichte des Erzbistums Hamburg-Bremen bis zum Ausgang der Mission.* 1. Band. Berlin, 1877.

W. Dersch, *Die Kirchenpolitik des Erzbischofs Aribo von Mainz, 1021-1031* Inaug. Diss. . . . Marburg. Marburg, 1899.

L. Dewez, *Histoire du Pays de Liège.* Bruxelles, 1822.

A. Dieckmeyer, *Die Stadt Cambrai. Verfassungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen aus dem zehnten bis gegen Ende des zwölften Jahrhunderts.* Bielefeld, 1890.

A. Dresdner, *Kultur- und Sittengeschichte der italienischen Geistlichkeit im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert.* Breslau, 1890.

R. Eisenburg, *Das Spolienrecht am Nachlass der Geistlichen in seiner geschichtlichen Entwickelung in Deutschland bis Friedrich II.* Inaug. Diss. . . . Marburg. Marburg, 1896.

E. Emerton, *Mediaeval Europe, 814-1300.* Boston, 1922.

H. Fisher, *The Medieval Empire.* 2 vols. London, 1898.

A. Flick, *The Rise of the Mediaeval Church and its Influence on the Civilization of Western Europe from the First to the Thirteenth Century.* New York, London, 1909.

H. Gerdes, *Die Bischofswahlen in Deutschland unter Otto dem Grossen in den Jahren 953 bis 973.* Inaug. Diss. . . . Göttingen. Hamburg, 1878.

H. Gerdes, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes und seiner Kultur im Mittelalter.* 1. Band. Leipzig, 1891.

J. Haller, *The Epochs of German History.* New York, 1930.

L. M. Hartmann, *Geschichte Italiens im Mittelalter.* 4. Band, 1. Hälfte, *Die Ottonische Herrschaft.* Gotha, 1915.

F. Hartz, *Das rheinische Herzogtum unter den Ottonen in politischer Hinsicht, 915-1002.* Inaug. Diss. . . . Bonn. Bonn, 1912.

A. Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands.* 1. Teil, dritte und vierte (Doppel) Auflage, 1904. 2. Teil, 1890. 3. Teil, dritte und vierte (Doppel) Auflage, 1906. Leipzig.

C. von Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte.* 4. Band, 2. Auflage. Freiburg i. Br., 1879.

C. Hegel, *Geschichte der Städteverfassung von Italien seit der Zeit der römischen Herrschaft bis zum Ausgang des zwölften Jahrhunderts.* 2. Band. Leipzig, 1847.

————*Verfassungsgeschichte von Cöln im Mittelalter.* Leipzig, 1877.

———— *Verfassungsgeschichte von Mainz im Mittelalter.* Leipzig, 1882.

T. Henner, *Die herzogliche Gewalt der Bischöfe von Wirzburg.* Inaug. Diss. . . . Wirzburg. Wirzburg, 1874.

H. Heusinger, *Servitium Regis in der deutschen Kaiserzeit. Untersuchungen über die wirtschaftlichen Verhältnisse des deutschen Königtums, 900-1250.* Berlin, Leipzig, 1922.

P. Hinschius, *System des katholischen Kirchenrechts mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Deutschland.* 2. Band. Berlin, 1878.

S. Hirsch, *Jahrbücher des deutschen Reichs unter Heinrich II.* 2. Band, vollendet von H. Pabst. 3. Band, hrsg. und vollendet von H. Bresslau. Berlin, 1862-1875.

Th. Ilgen, E. Gützner, F. Friedenburg, *Sphragistik, Heraldik, Deutsche Münzgeschichte.* Grundriss der Geschichtswissenschaft. Band I, Abtlg. 4. Leipzig, Berlin, 1912.

K. T. von Inama-Sternegg, *Deutsche Wirtschaftsgeschichte des 10. bis 12. Jahrhunderts.* Deutsche Wirtschaftsgeschichte, 2. Band. Leipzig, 1891.

F. Janner, *Geschichte der Bischöfe von Regensburg.* 1. Heft. Regensberg, New York, Cincinnati, 1883.

O. Kaemmel, *Die Besiedelung des deutschen Südostens vom Anfange des 10. bis gegen das Ende des 11. Jahrhunderts.* Leipzig, 1909.

J. P. Kirsch, *Kirchengeschichte.* 1. Band, *Die Kirche in der antiken griechischen-römischen Kulturwelt.* Freiburg i. Br., 1930.

A. M. Koeniger, *Burchard I von Worms und die deutsche Kirche seiner Zeit (1000-1025). Ein kirchen- und sittengeschichtliches Zeitbild.* München, 1905.

E. Köpke, E. Dümmler, *Kaiser Otto der Grosse.* Begonnen von Rudolf Köpke, vollendet von Ernst Dümmler. Leipzig, 1876.

R. Kötzschke, *Grundzüge der deutschen Wirtschaftsgeschichte bis zum 17. Jahrhundert.* Grundriss der Geschichtswissenschaft, Reihe II, Abtlg. 1. Leipzig, Berlin, 1923.

——— *Staat und Kultur im Zeitalter der ostdeutschen Kolonisation.* Leipzig, 1910.

G. Krüger, *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte* . . . in Verbindung mit Gerhard Ficker u. a. . . . 2. Auflage. 2. Band, G. Ficker, H. Hermelink, *Das Mittelalter.* Tübingen, 1929.

G. Kurth, *Notger de Liège et la Civilisation au x^e Siècle.* 2 vols. Paris, 1905.

E. Laehns, *Die Bischofswahlen in Deutschland von 936-1056 unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der königlichen Wahlprivilegien und der Teilnahme des Laienelementes.* Phil. Diss. . . . Greifswald. Greifswald, 1909.

E. Lauer, *The Significance of the Town Wall in the Development of the Medieval City.* A dissertation submitted . . . in candidacy for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Ms. University of Chicago Library, 1929.

J. Leidenroth, *Das Leben des Bischofs Meinwerk bis zum Römerzuge Heinrichs II.* Zur Entlassung der Abiturien . . . im Königlichen Gymnasium zu Hamm. Hamm, 1860.

C. P. Lepsius, *Geschichte der Bischöfe des Hochstifts Naumburg vor der Reformation. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Osterlandes . . . nach den Quellen bearbeitet.* Naumburg, 1846.

S. Löwenfeld, *Leo von Vercelli.* Inaug. Diss . . . Göttingen. Posen, 1877.

F. Lot, *Les derniers Carolingiens, Lothaire, Louis V, Charles de Lorraine (954-991).* Paris, 1891.

D. Lowis, *The History of the Church in France, A. D. 950-1000, being a Study in Mediaeval Christianity.* London, 1926.

H. Lüntzel, *Geschichte der Diöcese und Stadt Hildesheim.* Erster Theil. Hildesheim, 1858.

A. Meister, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte von den Anfängen bis ins 14. Jahrhundert.* Grundriss der Geschichtswissenschaft, 2. Auflage, Reihe II, Abtlg. 3. Leipzig, Berlin, 1913.

P. Merkert, *Kirche und Staat im Zeitalter der Ottonen.* Inaug. Diss. . . . Breslau. Breslau, 1905.

J. Möser, *Osnabrückische Geschichte.* Zweiter Theil. 3. Auflage. Berlin, Stettin, 1819.

O. Müller, *Die Entstehung der Landeshoheit der Bischöfe von Hildesheim.* Phil. Diss. . . . Freiburg i. Br. Heidelberg, 1908.

R. Müller, *Erzbischof Aribo von Mainz, 1021-1031.* Leipzig, 1881.

K. Nitzsch, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes bis zum Augsburger Religionsfrieden.* 1., 2. Band. 2. Auflage. Leipzig, 1892.
C. Oman, *The Dark Ages (476-918).* 6th ed. London, 1923.
E. von Ottenthal, *Die Regesten des Kaiserreichs unter den Herrschern aus dem saechsischen Hause, 919-1024.* Nach Johann Friedrich Böhmer neu bearbeitet. 1. Lieferung. Innsbruck, 1893.
R. Parisot, *Histoire de Lorraine (Duché de Lorraine, duché de Bar, Trois-Evêchés).* Tome I. Paris, 1919.
H. Pirenne, *Histoire Belgique.* Tome I, *Des origines au commencement du XIV^e siècle.* Deuxième edition. Bruxelles, 1902.
S. Pivano, *Stato e Chiesa da Berengario I ad Arduino (888-1015).* Torino, 1908.
A. Pöschl, *Die Regalien der mittelalterlichen Kirchen.* Festschrift der Grazer Universität für 1927. Graz, 1928.
W. Reinecke, *Geschichte der Stadt Cambrai bis sur Erteilung der Lex Godefridi (1227).* Marburg, 1896.
F. Remling, *Geschichte der Bischöfe zu Speyer.* 1. Band. Mainz, 1852.
R. Reuss, *Histoire de Strasbourg depuis ses origines jusqu'à nos jours.* Paris, 1922.
G. Richter, *Annalen der deutschen Geschichte im Mittelalter.* 1. Band. H. Kohl, *Annalen des deutschen Reichs im Zeitalter der Ottonen und Salier.* Halle, 1890.
S. Riezler, *Geschichte Baierns.* Band I, *bis 1180.* Gotha, 1878.
D. Schäfer, *Deutsche Geschichte.* 1. Band. Jena, 1910.
E. Schmidt, *Giseler, Bischof von Merseburg, Erzbischof von Magdeburg.* Inaug. Diss. . . . Halle- Wittenberg. Halle, 1886.
K. Schober, *Die Deutschen in Nieder- und Ober- Oesterreich, Salzburg, Steiermark, Kärnthen und Krain.* Wien, Teschen, 1881.
A. Schulte, *Der Adel und die deutsche Kirche im Mittelalter. Studien zur Sozialrechts- und Kirchengeschichte.* Stuttgart, 1910.
E. Schulze, *Die Kolonisierung und Germanisierung der Gebiete zwischen Saale und Elbe.* Leipzig, 1896.
G. Schwartz, *Die Besetzung der Bistümer Reichsitaliens unter den sächsischen und sälischen Kaisern, mit den Listen der Bischöfe, 951-1122.* Leipzig, Berlin, 1913.
F. Seelig, *Verleihungen Ottos I. an Bistümer und Klöster und deren Zusammenhang mit der Politik des Königs und Kaisers.* Phil. Diss. . . . Berlin. Berlin, 1919.
G. Seeliger, *Erzkanzler und Reichskanzleien. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des deutschen Reiches.* Innsbruck, 1899.
T. Sommerlad, *Die wirtschaftliche Tätigkeit der Kirche in Deutschland.* Band II. Leipzig, 1905.
P. Stälin, *Geschichte Württembergs.* 1. Band, 1. Hälfte, *bis 1268.* Gotha, 1882.

K. F. Stumpf, *Die Reichskanzler vornehmlich des X., XI. und XII. Jahrhunderts.* Erster und zweiter Bände. Innsbruck, 1865 ff.

S. Sugenheim, *Staatsleben des Klerus im Mittelalter.* 1. Band. Berlin, 1839.

M. Ter Braak, *Kaiser Otto III. Ideal und Praxis im fruehen Mittelalter.* Proefschrift . . . Amsterdam. Amsterdam, 1928.

R. Thommen, *Grundbegriffe Königs- und Kaiserurkunden.* Grundriss der Geschichtswissenschaft, Band I, Abtlg. 2. Leipzig, Berlin, 1913.

J. W. Thompson, *An Economic and Social History of the Middle Ages (300-1300).* New York, London, 1928.

———— *Feudal Germany.* Chicago, 1928.

———— *The Middle Ages, 300-1500.* 2 vol. New York, 1931.

T. F. Tout, *The Empire and the Papacy (918-1273).* 9th ed. London, 1921.

K. Uhlirz, *Jahrbücher des deutschen Reiches unter Otto II und Otto III.* 1. Band, *Otto II, 973-983.* Leipzig, 1902.

G. Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte.* Zweite Auflage bearbeitet von Karl Zeumer. 5., 6. Bände. Berlin, 1893.

———— *Jahrbücher des deutschen Reichs unter König Heinrich I.* 3. Auflage. Leipzig, 1885.

A. Werminghoff, *Verfassungsgeschichte der deutschen Kirche im Mittelalter.* 2. Auflage. Leipzig, Berlin, 1913.

H. Widmann, *Geschichte Salzburgs.* 1. Band, *bis 1270.* Gotha, 1907.

R. Wilmans, *Jahrbücher des deutschen Reichs unter der Herrschaft König und Kaiser Ottos III, 983-1002.* Berlin, 1840.

U. Zeller, *Bischof Salomo III von Konstanz, Abt von St. Gallen.* Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte des Mittelalters und Renaissance, 4. Heft. Leipzig, Berlin, 1910.

IV. Periodicals

H. Bloch, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Bischofs Leo von Vercelli und seiner Zeit.* Neues Archiv für deutsche Geschichtskunde, Band XXII. 1897, pp. 11-136.

A. Brackmann, *Die Ostpolitik Ottos des Grossen.* Historische Zeitschrift, Band 134, Heft 2, 1926, pp. 242-257.

E. Dümmler, *Über die Entstehung der Lorcher Fälschungen.* Sitzungsberichte der königlich-preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Jahrgang 1898, 2. Halbband, pp. 758-776.

J. Ficker, *Über das Eigentum des Reiches am Reichskirchengut.* Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Band LXXII, 1873, pp. 55 ff., 318 ff.

A. Hauck, *Die Entstehung der geistlichen Territorien.* Abhandlungen der königlichen sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenshaften, Band 57, Leipzig, 1909, pp. 647-672.

A. Hauck, *Über den Liber Decretorum Burchards von Worms.* Berichte über die Verhandlungen der königlichen sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Phil. Hist. Classe, Band, XLVI, 1894, pp. 65-88.

W. Hoppe, *Das Erzstift Magdeburg und der Osten.* Historische Zeitschrift, Band 135, Heft 3, 1926-1927, pp. 369-382.

J. von Pflugk-Harttung, *Das Bistum Merseburg unter den sächsischen Kaisern.* Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte, Band 25, Heft 1, Göttingen, 1885, pp. 152-177.

W. Wattenbach, *Über Widukind von Corvey und die Erzbischöfe von Mainz.* Sitzungsberichte der königlich-preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Jahrgang 1896, 1. Halbband, pp. 339-353.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I

9—Bishops in late Roman period. In early Christian Gaul. 10—In Merovingian Gaul. 13—Charles the Great. 14—His control of episcopate. 16—Subordination of monarchy to church. 17—Bishops east of Rhine. 19—Rise of dukes opposed by bishops. 20—Salomo of Constance and the Swabian dukes. 21—The Synod of Hohenaltheim.

Chapter II

A. 24—Henry I independent of church. Bavarian church subject to duke. 25—Subordination of monasteries to bishops in Bavaria. 26—Henry I and other dukes. Bishops lose political importance. 28—Bishops support revolts of dukes against Otto I. 33—Otto I supported by bishops. 36—Bavarian bishops support revolt against Otto II. 37—Struggle over regency for Otto III. 38—Struggle for crown after death of Otto III.

B. 39—Otto I's plans to create new archbishopric of Magdeburg defied by bishops. 40—His final success. 41—Bishopric of Merseburg founded by Otto I. 42—Suppressed by Otto II. 44—Restored by Henry II. Emperor and pope defied by bishop. 46—Henry II founds bishopric of Bamberg. Opposition and defiance of bishops. 48—Cluniac reform. Rivalry of regular and secular clergy. 50—Struggle of Mainz and Hildesheim over nunnery of Gandersheim. 52—Emperor and pope defied by bishop. 53—Renewal of struggle. 55—Emperor and archbishop of Mainz defied by Count Otto of Hammerstein. Dispute between pope and archdiocese of Mainz.

C. 57—Rivalry of bishops and nobility. 58—Open warfare between them. 60—Duke successfully challenged by bishop of Worms. 62—Hostility of lesser nobility to church. 63—Depredations of Saxon nobles. 65—Similar depredations elsewhere. 66—The advocate.

D. 67—Royal control of episcopal elections. 69—Forms of procedure in elections. Status of right of free election. 71—Procedure previous to election. 73—Investiture of bishop. 74—Bishops generally of noble blood; exceptions. 75—Bishops from royal family and nobility. 78—Previous service in chancellery.

E. 78—Current theory of royal investiture of bishop with rights and property of church. 81—This theory questioned. 83—Beginnings of German ecclesiastical territorial state. 84—Dominion within episcopal city. 85—County grants; immunity. 86—The advocate.

F. 89—Attitude of bishop towards demands for *servitia*. 90—Entertainment of the court. 91—Alienation of royal land to church. 92—*Servitia* undefined. 93—Activity of bishops at court.

G. 94—Otto I resumes policy of supporting church against nobility. 95—Grants of land to church. Extension of immunity. 96—Evidence of these policies. 97—Episcopal opposition to crown. Feudal character of episcopate. 98—Dangers of Ottonian policy. 99—Church long since necessary for government.

Chapter III

101—Claims of Carolingians to Lorraine. 102—Lorraine in 9th century. 103—In 10th century. Henry I acquires Lorraine. 104—His control of episcopate. 105—Marriage alliances between Ottonians and

Carolingians and counts of Paris. 106—Revolts in Lorraine against Otto I. End of Carolingian threat to Lorraine. Otto I's episcopal policy in Lorraine. 107—Conrad, German duke of Lorraine. 108—Lorraine put in charge of Bruno of Cologne. 109—His early life and character. 110—Extent of his responsibilities. 111—Bruno deals with Duke Conrad. 112—Difficulties with Lorraine nobility. 113—Lorraine subdivided into two duchies. 114—Bruno imports German bishops. 116—His influence at Rheims. Intervention in French affairs. 117—His death. 118—His leadership passes to Notger of Liège. Final peace with France. 119—Liège under Evararchar. 120—Notger develops Liège schools. His influence in episcopal elections. 123—His successful struggle against local nobility at Liège. 125—Difficulties of bishops at Cambrai. 126—Successful struggle of bishop against count. 127—Difficulties of bishop with people and his own soldiery. 128—Struggle of bishops of Cambrai with their advocates. 131—Interference of Baldwin of Flanders. 132—Bishops get full county jurisdiction. 133—Continuation of struggle with advocate. 136—Control of bishopric of Metz by Luxemburger family. They successfully defy Henry II in feud over bishopric of Trier. 138—Henry II finally instals bishop of his choice. Struggles of bishops of Lower Lorraine against feudal houses. 140—Unsuccessful struggle against count of Holland.

CHAPTER IV

142—German bishops active in Italy. 144—Local conditions peculiar to Italy. 145—Status of bishops and nobility in Italy. 146—Personnel of Italian episcopate. Importation of Germans. 147—Imperial support of bishops in northern Italy. 150—Episcopal corruption and maladministration. 151—Otto III's Edict of Pavia. 152—Leo of Vercelli. 153—Vercelli under his predecessors. Arduin, *Pfalzgraf* of Lombardy. 154—Leo challenges Arduin. Privileges granted to Vercelli. 156—Leo's relations with Otto III and Sylvester II. 157—Arduin rebels after death of Otto III. 158—Leo and Henry II. 160—Leo finally suppresses Arduin. His feud with Arduin's successors. 163—His subsequent activities under Henry II and Conrad I.

CHAPTER V

166—Opportunities offered bishops by Otto I's plans for eastern frontier. 167—Missionary activities of bishops of Hamburg-Bremen. 168—Three new Danish bishoprics. 169—Interference from England. 170—Relations between Germans and Slavs on Elbe-Saale frontier. 171—Otto I's frontier policy. 172—Three new Slav bishoprics. New archbishopric of Magdeburg. 173—Missionary activity among Slavs. 174—The new Slav bishoprics under Otto I and Otto II. 175—Under Otto III and Henry II. 177—Military basis of Slav bishoprics. 178—Their scanty endowment. 179—Attitude of bishops toward Slavs. 180—Establishment of Polish church. 181—German bishops at Prague. 182—Peaceful activity of bishops on Bavarian frontier. Effect of Hungarian incursions. 183—Resumption of colonisation. 184—Activity of bishops of Regensburg and Salzburg. 185—Of bishops of Passau. Pilgrim expands see of Passau, largely by forgery. 187—His missionary activity in Hungary. 188—His fabrication of the archbishopric of Lorch.

CHAPTER VI

189—Bishops the officialdom of the Ottonian state. Personal relations between king and bishop; striking examples. 193—Bishops as educators.

194—Archbishops of Mainz win right to crown newly elected king. 195—The chancellery. Development of chapel and chancellery from Carolingian period. 197—Special regional chancelleries. 198—Personnel of chancellery. 199—Bishops from chancellery. 200—Attendance of bishops at court. 202—Diplomatic services of bishops. Bishops as arbitrators. 203—Bishops as custodians. Career of Willigis of Mainz from Otto II to Henry II.

CHAPTER VII

206—Bishops chosen from military feudal nobility. Necessity of military service from church. 208—Bishops in battle against Hungarians. 209—Military power of church based on land. 210—Military activity of Lorraine bishops. 211—Of bishops in Italy and elsewhere. 212—On eastern frontier. 213—Immunity or exemption from military service. 214—The summons of 981. 215—The summons of 1001. Building of fortifications. 218—Restoration and enlargement of cities; non-military building activity.

CHAPTER VIII

223—Importance to bishop of increasing patrimony of his church. Necessary reliance on crown. 224—Purchase and exchange. 225—Superior administration of bishops. 227—Episcopal *ministeriales*. 228—Administration of Willigis of Mainz and Udalrich of Augsburg. 229—Arts and crafts at Hildesheim. 231—Efforts of Thietmar to recover endowment of Merseburg. 233—Confusion of canon law. Burchard of Worms. 234—His *Liber Decretorum*. Disorder in diocese of Worms. 235—His *Hofrecht*. Meinwerk of Paderborn. 236—His friendship with Henry II. 237—His utilization thereof. 239—Artisans at Paderborn. 240—His supervision of his tenants.

CHAPTER IX

242—Megingaud of Eichstätt. 243—His belly and his temper. 244—His profanity. His informality. 245—Individual peculiarities of other bishops. 247—Bishops as hosts. 248—Criticism of secular preoccupations of bishops. 249—Necessity of these. 250—Ecclesiastical duties not neglected. 251—The burden too heavy.

INDEX RERUM

This index, unlike the following *Index Personarum* and *Index Locorum*, does not pretend to be complete. It is meant only to supplement the Table of Contents, for convenience of reference to certain points of some interest or importance not easily included therein.

Absence of bishops, 128, 134, 135, 137, 169, 176, 177, 178, VI.[32]
Advocate, 15, 131, 132, 186, 234.
Alienation, 150, IV,[31] 151, 153, 225, 235.
Aqueducts, I.[9]
Arimannen, 145.
Astronomy, 119, 120.
Avars, 182.

Besitz, 80.
Bishops, irregular, 14.
courts, 227, VIII,[14] VIII.[16]
of low birth, 74, 75, 228.
quarrels with church, 115, 122, 150, 174.
wealthy, 72, II,[173] 237.
withdrawal from candidacy, 224.
Blinding of bishops, 22, I,[72] II, [31] 104.
Blutbann, 85, 86, 128.
Bohemians, I.[63]
Bonifacian reform, 13.
Breweries, 226.
Bribery, I,[19] 43, II,[73] II,[173] 121.
Bridges, VII,[50] 218.
Bulgars, 182.
Burggraf, 128.
Burgward, 171, 178.

Chamberlain, 227.
Chancellery, chapel, bishops from, II,[188] II,[189] IV,[18] VI.[28]
Châtelain, 128.
Classics, III.[15]
Clergy, of low birth, 16.
married, VIII,[9] IX.[23]
regular, bishops from, 40, II,[171] 75, II,[187] 173, V.[75]
Cluniac reform, 48.
Colonization, 174, 175, 184, 186.
Comes palatii, 148.
Confiscation, 15, II,[215] 113, 138, 154, 160, 164.
County rights, 84, II,[201] 104, 127, 136, 148. 154, 155.
Cup-bearer, 227.
Custody of bishops, 29, 36, 37, 202.

Danes, I,[53] 167, 217.
Desecration of churches, 113, 134.
by bishop, 115.
Docks, 219.
Droit de gite, 66.
Drunkenness, I,[17] 246, 247.
Ducal families, bishops from, II,[7] 32, 33, II.[185]

Edict of Pavia, 153, 157.
Eigenkirchen, I,[30] 67, 80.
Exchanges of property, II.[215]
Excommunication, 60, III,[3] 135, 163.

Family interest of bishops, II,[185] 153.
Feudalism, supported by bishops, II,[41] 97.
Fisheries, 139, 140.
Forgery, 44, 164, 184, 198.
Fornication, I.[17]
Fortifications, 34, 52, 60, 61, 85, 132, 133, 140, 149.
Free election, II.[159]
French frivolity (sic), III,[111] III.[114]

Gerichtsbann, 84.
Grants to church, II,[12] II.[202]
Greek, 202, 242.

Hebrew, 242.
Hungarians, I,[53] II,[3] 31, 48, 112, 145, 182, 184, 186, 187, 188, 217, 218, 221.
Hunting, 63, 64, 140, 245.

Illumination, 20.
Immunity, 10, 15, 86, 126, 132, 147, 168, 185.
Imprisonment of bishop, 21.
Intercessors, II,[12] 71.
Investiture struggle, 82, 99.
Itineraries of kings, II,[208] II.[210]

Kapitelsgut, 225.

Liutizi, 180, VII.[28]
Logotheta, 156.

Markets, 84, 133, 226.
Marshall, 227.
Mediatekirchen, 80.
Military service, by bishops, I,[57] 25, 33, 117, 141, IV,[5] 153, 159, 162, 163.
of monasteries, 214.
by popes, 206.
Mills, 226.
Mines, 155.
Ministeriales, 75, 88, 234.
Mints, 84, 126, 133, 226.
Missi, 14, 15, 122, 134, 144, 148, 156.
Missionary activity, 183, V,[51] 187.
Monasteries, landholdings, I.[30]
secularization, 24, 25, II.[3]
subordinated to bishops, II,[4] 49, II,[89] 146. 149, 185, 226, 229.
Tuscan, 149.
Murder, by bishop, I,[17] I,[47] 21, 115.
of bishop, 153, 174.
Music, 242, 248.

Nibelungenlied, 185.
Nobility, bishops from, II,[188] 146.
Normans, 217.
Nutzeigentum, 80.

Obodrites, 171, 173, 219.

Penance, 16, 23, 154.
Piety, mediaeval, II.[214]
Poetry, 20, II,[127] 119, III,[67] IV,[48] IV,[53] IV.[77]
Poles, 220.

Pope defied by bishop, II.[51]
Prälatengut, 225.
Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, 16.
Public works, 10.

Quarries, 220.

Reform of monasteries, II,[21] 48.
Rechtsträger, 80.
Rechtsfähigkeit, 81.
Regalia, 79, 82, II,[194] 83, 85.
Regalienrecht, 92.
Regaliensperre, 92.
Reichseigenkirchen, 80.
Reichsgut, 80.
Reichskirchen, 80, 81.
Reichskirchengut, 79.
Relics, 211, 231, 236, 250, 251, IX.[43]
Rivers, control of, I,[9] 219.
Royal family, bishops from, II.[184]

Saracens, IV,[5] 144.
Scandal, about bishops, II,[44] 146, 246, IX.[23]
Scandinavians, 167.
Schools, 21, 42, 109, 118, 120, III,[50] 181.
Scriptoria, 229.
Secularization, 19, 22, 24, 25, II,[3] 48.
Secundi milites, 145.
Servitia, 15, 59.
Simony, cf. bribery.
Slavs, I,[53] 44, 137.
Slovenes, 182.
Soldiers of bishops, 63, 64, 65, 122, 127, VIII.
Sorbs, 175.
Spiritualia, 82, II.[194]
Spolienrecht, 92.
Steward, 227.
Swedes, 167.

Taxing rights, 11.
Temporalia, 79, 85.
Tithes, 49, 63, 178, 186, 228.
Tolls, 84, 126, 133, 140, 185, 226.
Trickery by bishops, I,[37] 124, 125, III.[129]

Vandals, I.[5]
Vicedominus, 227, 234.
Vikings, 102, 119, 207, 218.
Villicus, 91.

Wends, 40, 172, 177, 182.
Wildbann, 85.
Winuli, V,[12] 173.

INDEX PERSONARUM

Names of bishops, abbots and abbesses are followed by the name of the diocese or monastery, e.g., Meinwerk of Paderborn. For other clergy the diocese or monastery is added in parentheses, e.g., Adalbero (Augsburg).

Names of secular nobility are printed in italics, with the territory or family added in parentheses, dukes and margraves being specified also by title, e.g., *Adalbert* (*Babenberg*), *Arnulf* (*duke Bavaria*).

Names of German kings and immediate members of the royal family are printed in small capitals, except of those that were also bishops or clergy, e.g., ADELHEID. Names of other kings are printed in small capitals, with their territory added in parentheses, e.g., ROBERT II (France).

Abraham of Freising, 36, IV,[6] VI,[2] 194, VIII,[11] IX.[23]
Adalbero of Augsburg, 228.
Adalbero (Augsburg), II,[185] II,[212] 192, 250.
Adalbero I of Metz, 29.
Adalbero II of Metz, 104, 106, 107, 136.
Adalbero III of Metz, 136.
Adalbero of Trier, 136, 137, 138.
Adalbert (*Babenberg*), I.[47]
Adalbert of Hamburg-Bremen, VIII.[4]
Adalbert of Magdeburg, 42, II,[187] IV,[6] 174, 175, 203, 204.
Adalbert of Passau, 185.
Adalbert of Prague, IV,[6] 180, 181, 204.
Adalbert (*Swabia*), 21.
Adalbert (*Swabia*), II,[33] 34.
Adalbert (*Trier*), III.[128]
Adalbold of Utrecht, 120, 121, 140, III,[130] 203.
Adaldag of Hamburg-Bremen, 70, 72, IV,[6] 168, 170, 172, 173, 190, VI,[2] VI,[24] VI,[28] VI,[32] 202, IX.[21]
Adalgar of Hamburg-Bremen, 250.
Adalgar (Hamburg-Bremen), VI.[33]
Adalward of Verden, II.[13]
Adela (*Lorraine*), 140, 238.
ADELHEID, 117, 190, 204.
Aethelbert (*Saxony*), 64.
Albrecht (*margrave Saxony*), V.[25]
Albuin of Seben-Brixen, 65, II,[186] IV,[7] VII.[31]
Aldo (*Lorraine*), III.[130]
Altmann (*Braunschweig*), II.[13]
Amelung of Verden, II.[15]
Anno of Worms, II,[187] VI.[24]
Ansbert of Cambrai, 127.
Ansfrid of Utrecht, II,[174] 116, 121, 218.
Anskar of Hamburg-Bremen, 167, V,[4] 170.
Arduin (*Pfalzgraf Lombardy*), IV,[28] 158-160, 161, IV,[56] 164, IV,[77] 198.
Aribert of Milan, 164, IV.[77]
Aribo of Mainz, 50, 53-55, II,[102] 56, 57, 72, II,[172] II,[184] 195, 204, IX.[23]
Aribone (*Chiemgau*), II.[186]
Arnold of Ravenna, 147.
Arnold of Treviso, IV.[16]
Arn of Würzburg, VII.[8]
ARNULF, 18, 19, II,[12] II,[201] 185.
Arnulf (*duke Bavaria*), 19, 20, I,[57] 23, 24, 25 ff., 32, 58, II.[185]
Arnulf (*Pfalzgraf Bavaria*), 32, 33.
Arnulf (*duke Carinthia*), 102.
Arnulf (*Flanders*), III.[37]
Arnulf of Halberstadt, 38, 45, 64, 65, 70, 182, VI,[2] 203, VII,[28] 220.
Arnulf of Metz, 11.
Arnulf (*Valenciennes*), 130, 131.
Arnulfinger (*Bavaria*), 91.
Artaud of Rheims, 107, 116.
Ascuin (*Seben-Brixen*), II.[215]
Athelbert (*Trier*), III.[129]
Azelin (*Flanders*), 121, 131.

Babenberger, 183.
Balderich of Liège, 114, 115, 140, 141, VII,[29] VII,[53] VIII,[3] IX.[23]
Balderich (*Lorraine*), 140.
Balderich of Speyer, IV.[7]
Balderich of Utrecht, II,[43] 109, 111, 112, 201, 218, VII.[51]
Baldwin (*Flanders*), 122, 131, III,[98] III,[108] 211.
Baldwin (*Flanders*), III.[98]
Bar-Ardenne (*Lorraine*), 104, 118, 136, 139.
Benedict V, 202, VII.[3]
Benedict VI, 188.
Benedict VII, 195.
Benedict VIII, 56, 138, 151, IV,[35] 164, 202.
Benno of Metz, 104.
Berchtold (*Swabia*), I,[53] 21, 23.
Berengar of Cambrai, II,[184] 115, III,[37] 127.
BERENGAR (Lombards), IV.[14]
Berengar of Passau, 186.
Berengar of Verdun, II,[184] 107, 111, 116.
Bernain of Verdun, 29, 104, 106.
Bernard (*Liège*), 123.
Bernhard (*margrave Brandenburg*), 65, II,[144] II.[145]
Bernhard of Halberstadt, 40, 41, 106.
Bernhard of Oldenburg, 176, V,[32] 178.
Bernhard (*duke Saxony*), 60, 64, II,[186] V,[12] 176, V,[41] VII,[28] 217.
Bernward of Hildesheim, 39, 50 ff., 64, II,[186] III,[55] IV,[8] 155, IV,[46] 169, 190, VI,[2] 192, 193, 194, VI,[25] 204, 211, 216, VIII,[1] 229, 230, 233, IX,[19] IX,[21] 249.
Bernward of Verden, VIII.[1]
Berthold (*Walbeck*), 212.
Bertolf of Trier, 102.
Billunger (*Saxony*), 60, II.[185]
Boleslav II (*duke Bohemia*), 181.
Bolcslav III (*duke Bohemia*), 181.
Boleslav (*duke Poland*), 170, 180, 202, VII.[28]
Boniface, St., I,[17] 13, I.[20]
Boso (*Burgundy*), 105.

Boso of Merseburg, II,[187] 173, V,[15] 179.
Branthog of Halberstadt, II.[187]
Brunhard (goldsmith Paderborn), VIII.[71]
Bruning of Asti, VI.[20]
Bruno of Augsburg, 39, II,[184] IV,[9] VI.[28]
Bruno (*Braunschweig*), 64.
Bruno of Cologne, 31, II,[28] II,[41] II,[184] 108-118, III,[1] III,[15] III,[2] III,[27] III,[2] III.[37] 121, 141, IV,[6] 152, 194, 197, VI,[23] 201, 221, VIII,[14] VIII,[16] 248, IX,[33] 249.
Bruno of Verden, 60, II,[185] II,[197] 187.
Burchard (*duke Swabia*), I,[68] 21, 26, II,[7] 58, II.[185]
Burchard (*Swabia*), II.[185]
Burchard of Worms, II,[58] II,[110] 60 ff., II,[124] 66, 67, II,[174] II,[212] 96, III,[51] 120, 122, 124, IV,[9] VI,[2] 193, 194, VI,[34] VII,[34] 220, VII,[60] VIII,[14] 233-235, VIII,[43] 251.

CAPET, HUGH, 113.
Capetians, 99, 103, 118, 201.
Carolingians, 17, II,[12] II,[17] II,[203] 101, 102. 105, 106, 111, 113, 116, 117, 118, 145, 201.
Cautinus of Clermont, I.[17]
Charles (*duke Lorraine*), 116, 118, 130, 210.
CHARLES THE BALD, 17.
CHARLES THE FAT, 18, I,[45] 20, 102.
CHARLES THE GREAT, 13-16, I,[34] 102, 170 171, 185, 207, VII.[6]
Charles Martel, 13.
CHARLES THE SIMPLE, II,[171] 103.
CHILPERIC, 11.
CHLOTHAR II, I.[13]
Christian of Passau, 59, IV.[8]
CLOVIS, 41.
Conrad (*duke Lorraine*), 31, 34, 107, III.[6] III,[8] III,[27] 108, 111, 112.
CONRAD I, 19, 20, I,[77] II,[12] 103, VI,[2] 204.
CONRAD II, 53, 133, 164, 187, 193, 194, 195, 205.

DAGOBERT, I.[17]
Daniel of Winchester, I.[20]
Dankbrand (Norway), V.[7]
Deothmar of Prague, 181.
Desiderius of Cahors, I.[9]
Dietpald (*Swabia*), II.[33]
Dietrich (*Holland*), 140, 141, 215.
Dietrich (*duke Lorraine*), 136.
Dietrich I of Metz, 38, 42, 43, II,[73] II,[184] 116, IV,[6] IV,[7] VI,[2] 192, VI,[4] 202, 204. 210, IX.[43]
Dietrich II of Metz, II,[184] II,[188] 136, 137, 138.
Dioto of Würzburg, I.[87]
Dodilo of Brandenburg, 174, 177.
Dodilo of Cambrai, 217.
Dodo of Osnabrück, II.[12]
Drakolf of Freising, II,[4] 183.
Droctigisil of Soissons, I.[17]
Drogo of Osnabrück, IV.[6]
Durand of Liège, II,[108] 75, 120.

Eberhard, 104.
Eberhard of Hamberg, II,[184] IV,[9] VI.[28]
Eberhard (*duke Bavaria*), 28.
Eberhard of Como, IV.[16]
Eberhard (*duke Franconia*), 26, 28, II,[20] 106, 203.
EDITH, 104.
EDGWA, 104.
Egbert (*Saxony*), 112.
Egbert of Trier, 37, IV,[7] VI.[28]
Egidius of Rheims, 11.
Egilbert of Freising, VI.[28]
Egiluff of Hersfeld, 40.
Eid of Meissen, 65, IV,[9] 175, 178, VII.[28]
Eilward of Meissen, 232.
Ekkehard (*margrave Meissen*), 39, 63, II,[123] II.[183]
Ekkehard of Prague, 181
Ekkehard of Schleswig, 51, 169, 176.
Elnod of Canterbury, V.[8]
EMMA, 117.
Engilbert of St. Gall, II.[6]
Erchanger (*Swabia*), 21, 23, I.[77]
ERIC THE VICTORIOUS (Sweden, Denmark), 169.
Erich of Havelburg, 177.
Erich (*Werle*), II.[196]
Erkanbald of Fulda, 211, VII.[22]
Erkanbald of Mainz, 55, II,[197] 138, IV.[9] IX.
Erkanbald of Strassburg, IV.[7]
Erluin of Cambrai, II,[184] 120, 121, 131, 132, 133.
Erpho (goldsmith Paderborn), VIII.[71]
Ethelger (candidate Merseburg), II.[172]
Eunius of Vannes, I.[17]
Everarchar of Liège, 115, 119, 120, III,[51] 122, IV.[6]
Eziko of Oldenburg, 176.

Felix of Nantes, I.[9]
Folcmar of Brandenburg, 177.
Folcmar of Paderborn, II.[187]
Folcmar (Poppo) of Utrecht, 37, II,[49] VI,[28] 203.
Folcward of Oldenburg, 176.
Franko of Liège, VII.[5]
Franko of Worms, IV.[8] VI,[7] VI.[32]
Frederick (*Bar, duke Lorraine*), 104, 113, 136.
Frederick of Cambrai, VIII.[1]
Frederick (Iceland), V.[7]
Frederick of Mainz, 29-32, II,[20] II,[21] II,[22] II,[26] 34-36, II,[41] 40, IV,[8] 172.
Frederick of Ravenna, 52, II,[94] 147, 158.
Frederick of Salzburg, II,[21] 37, II,[89] II,[186] IV,[6] IV,[7] 183, 184, 185, VIII.[9]
Fulbert of Cambrai, 111, 115, 127, 208, 217, IX.[43]

Gaudentius of Gnesen, 181.
Gauzlin of Toul, II,[13] 29, 104, 106, 116, IV.[6]
Gebehard of Regensburg, II,[80] 246.
Gesa (*duke Hungary*), 187.
George of (Cappadocia) Alexandria, I.[3]
Gerard (*Alsace*), 212.
Gerard of Cambrai, III,[98] 133, 134, 135, III,[111] III,[130] 141, VI,[6] 211, 217, 220.
Gerard of Toul, 116.
GERBERGA, 104, 106, 116, 117.
Gerbert (cf. Sylvester II), of Bobbio, IV[31]; of Ravenna, 147, 152; of Rheims, 121, 147, IV.[8]
Gerbrand of Seeland, 169.
Gero of Cologne, II,[186] IV,[6] 202.
Gero of Magdeburg, 65, II,[144] II,[145] 71, 212, VII,[28] 217, 220, 232.
Gero (*margrave Saxony*), 64, 65, 171.
Gero (*Saxony*), 203.
Gisclbert (*Lorraine*), 28, 29, II,[20] 103, 104, 111,[6] 106, 117.

Giselbert (Vercelli), 154.
Giseler of Merseburg, Magdeburg, 37, 38, 41-45, II,[134] 70, IV,[7] 173, 174, 175, 178, 190, VI,[2] VI,[32] 204, 212, VII,[28] VIII.[12]
Godehard of Hildesheim, 50, 53, 54, 75, II,[187] VI,[2] 216, 229, 230, IX.[39]
Godfrey (*Verdun, duke Lorraine*), 139, 140.
Godfrey (*Verdun*), 130.
GORM THE OLD (Denmark), 167.
Gotabert (Salzburg), 183.
Gottfried (*duke Lorraine*), 113, 114.
Gottschalk of Freising, IV,[8] VII.[28]
Gottschalk (Liège), II.[182]
Gozelo (*duke Lorraine*), 139.
Gregory I, 11.
Gregory V, 44, 132, 154, 156, IV,[51] 202.
Gregory of Tours, 10.
Guncelin (*margrave Meissen*), 203.
Gundekar of Eichstätt, 48, II,[85] 74, 75, 245.
Gunther of Osnabrück, IV.[8]
Gunther of Regensburg, II,[171] II.[187]
Gunther of Salzburg, II,[183] 120, 199, VI.[28]
Gunther of Tours, I.[17]

Hadumar of Fulda, II.[20]
HAKON (Norway), 169.
HAROLD BLUETOOTH (Denmark), 167, 168.
Harold of Salzburg, 31, 32, II,[31] 59, II.[185]
Hartbert of Chur, 34, 35, IV.[6]
Hartwich of Salzburg, II,[186] IV,[8] VIII.[9]
Hatto I of Mainz, 18, 19, I,[51] 20, 204.
Hatto II of Mainz, 40, II,[187] IV.[6]
HEDWIG, 105, 116.
Hedwig of Gernrode, 64.
Heimo of Verdun, 120, IV,[8] 219.
HENRY I, I,[47] 19, 20, 23, 24 ff., II,[12] 29, 68, II,[209] 94, 98, 103, 104, 105, 167, 171, VI,[2] 194, VI,[29] 211.
HENRY II, II,[58] 39, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 53, 55, 56, 59, 60, 61, 63, 65, 66, 68, 69, II,[159] 70, 71, II,[169] 72, II,[172] II,[173] 74, II,[180] 85, II,[201] II,[202] 89, 90, 91, II,[209] II,[210] 95, II,[214] II,[215] 122, 131, 133, 134, 135, III,[111] 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 143, 146, 147, IV,[16] IV,[22] 151, IV,[50] 158, 159, 160, 161, IV,[66] 162, IV,[70] 164, 175, V,[31] V,[36] 180, 181, 182, 186, 190, VI,[2] 193, VI,[6] 194, 195, 198, 199, 201, 202, 203, 204, 211, 212, VII[26] VII,[26] 226, 231, 232, 236-239, VIII,[57] IX.[16]
Henry of Augsburg, 36, 37, 59, II,[177] II,[183] II,[212] IV,[5] IV,[7] VIII,[13] IX.[25]
Henry (*duke Bavaria*), 28, 29, 31, 106, 107.
Henry (*Bavaria*), II.[21]
Henry (*the Quarrelsome or the Wrangler, duke Bavaria*), II,[31] 36, 37, 121, 203.
Henry (*duke Carinthia*), 36.
Henry (*margrave Schweinfurt*), 39, 204, 211.
Henry of Trier, II,[184] 114, IV,[4] IV,[5] 194.
Henry of Würzburg, 39, 46, 47, IV,[8] IV,[9] 161, 182, 190, 211, VII,[50] IX.[25]
Herbert (*Vermandois*), 103.
Heribert of Cologne, 39, 64, 69, 140, IV,[3] IV[8] IV,[9] 144, 149, 156, 159, 161, VI,[6] 198, VI,[28] 204, 212, VII,[29] 249.
Heribert of Eichstätt, II,[177] 221, 222.
Heriger of Mainz, I,[57] II,[13] 194.
Heriward (*Cambrai*), III.[38]
Herman of Hamburg-Bremen, VII.[55]
Herman (*duke Saxony*), 60, II,[185] 112.
Herman (*Saxony*), 63.
Herman (*duke Swabia*), 38, 39, 58, 59.
Herman Billung (*margrave Saxony*), 171.
Hezelo of Toul, 120.
Hieronymus of Vicenza, 160.
Hildebald of Worms, IV,[7] IV,[8] VI,[28] 204.
Hildebert of Mainz, II,[13] 194.
Hilderich of Havelburg, 176.
Hildeward of Halberstadt, 41, 42, II,[183] IV,[6] VII.[28]
Hilduin of Liège, II.[173]
Hiltin of Augsburg, I.[57]
Hiltolf of Mantua, IV.[16]
Hincmar of Rheims, 16, 17, I.[41]
Hored of Schleswig, 168.
Hugh (*Lorraine*), 102.
Hugh (*of Francia, Paris*), 105, 107, 116, VII.[18]
Hugo of Rheims, 107, III.[9]
Hugo (*margrave Tuscany*), 154.
Hugo of Verdun, 104, VIII.[5]
Hugo (candidate Verdun), 224.
Hugo of Zeitz, IV.[8]
Hupald (nephew Udalrich Augsburg), II.[212]

Immendinger (*Saxony*), II.[186]
Immo (*Liège*), 125.
Immo (*Lorraine*), 106, 113.
Ingo of Vercelli, IV.[38]
Ingrann of Cambrai, 115, VIII.[1]
Irmingarde (*Hammerstein*), 55, 56.
Isaac (*Cambrai*), 126, 127.

Jacob of Fiesole, IV.[16]
Jaromir (*duke Bohemia*), 203.
John X, 68.
John XII, II,[31] 116, VII.[4]
John XIII, II.[31]
John (*Cambrai*), 128, 129.
John of Gorze, 247.
John (Calabria) of Piacenza, 146.
John of Ravenna, 195.
Jordan of Posen, 180.
Judith (*Bavaria*), 36, II,[44] IX.[23]

KNUT (Denmark, England), 169, 202.
Kriemhilde, 185.
Kunigund (*Seben-Brixen*), II.[215]
KUNIGUNDE, 56, 136, 202.

Lambert (*Ravenna*), 150.
Landbert of Constance, 38, IV.[8]
Lantbert (*Lorraine*), 140.
Lantward of Minden, IV,[6] VI.[2]
Leo III, 14.
Leo VIII, 202.
Leo of Vercelli, 152-165, IV,[37] IV,[46] IV,[51] IV,[56] IV,[66] IV,[71] IV.[77]
Leodegar of Autun, 11.
Liäwizo of Hamburg-Bremen, 70, 169, 176, VI,[30] 217, VII.[55]
Liafdag of Ripen, 168, 169.
Liudolf of Osnabrück, II,[184] IV,[6] 199, VI.[28]
Liudolf (*Saxony*), 112.
Liudolf (*duke Swabia*), 31, II,[25] 33, 35.
Liudolfinger (*Saxony*), I,[53] II,[208] 91.
Liutbald (*margrave Bavaria*), V.[79]
Liutbert of Mainz, 18, 196, VII.[8]
Liutfrid (*Swabia*), 21.
LIUTGARDE, 107.
Liutpold (*Babenberg margrave*), 138.
Liutpold (*Bavaria*), I.[53]
Liutprand of Cremona, 202.
LOTHAR (France), III,[19] 116, 117, 121, 129, 130, 210.

LOTHAR II (Lorraine), 102.
LOUIS II, VII.[7]
LOUIS III, I.[41]
LOUIS THE CHILD, 18, 20, 102, 103.
LOUIS IV (d'Outremer), 105-107, III.[9]
LOUIS THE CHILD, 18, 20, 102, 103.
LUDWIG (the Younger or the Saxon) (Saxony and Lorraine), 102.
Luxemburger (Lützelburger) (Lorraine), 136, 137.

Manasse of Milan, VI.[20]
Manegold (nephew Udalrich Augsburg), II.[212]
Manfred (Turin), 160, 161. IV.[72]
MATHILDE, 104.
Mathilde of Quedlinburg. 121.
Megingaud of Eichstätt, 46, 47, 48, II,[86] II,[89] 74, II,[184] 89, 90, VIII.[13] 242-245.
Megingaud of Trier, 136, 137, 138.
Meinwerk of Paderborn, 64, 72, II,[173] II,[177] II,[186] 140, IV,[9] 143, 190, VI,[2] VI,[32] VII,[28] 217, 232, 235-241, VIII,[5] VIII,[7] VIII,[9] VIII,[70] VIII,[82] 242.
Merovingians, 10, 13.
Michael of Regensburg, II,[171] 208, VII.[28]
Miesko I (duke Poland), 180, VII.[28]

Nicetius of Lyons, I.[8]
Nicholas I, 16.
Notger of Liège, 118-125, III.[61] 125, 130. 131, III,[129] 141, IV,[7] IV,[12] 199, 204, VII,[14] 219, VII,[53] VII,[55] 251.
Notger of Lodi, IV.[16]
Noting of Constance, II.[13]

Octavian (Rome), IV.[2]
Odalbert of Salzburg, 25, II,[186] VIII,[6] IX.[28]
Oddo of Hamburg-Bremen, 70.
Odelrich of Rheims, 116.
Odo (Champagne), 135.
Ohtrich of Magdeburg, 42.
OLAF (Sweden), 170.
OLAF THE FAT (Norway), 169.
OLAF TRYGGWASON (Norway), V.[7]
Osdag of Hildesheim, 50.
Othert of Verona, 158.
Otger of Speyer, IV,[2] IV.[6]
Othelrich of Chur, 38.
Othwin of Hildesheim, II,[147] IV,[6] VI,[32] IX.[47]
OTTO I, 26, 28 ff., II,[20] II,[26] 39, 40, 41, 50, 59, 68, II,[159] 69, II,[171] II,[186] II,[199] II,[202] II,[209] II,[212] 94, 95, 99, II,[215] 105-108, III,[12] 109, 110, 111, 112, III,[30] 114, 115, 116, 117, 121, 127, 142, 146, IV,[18] IV,[32] 166, 168, 171, 172, 173, V,[20] V,[31] V,[37] 180, 181, 185, 187, 188, 190, 197, 198, 199, VI,[29] 201, VI,[32] 202, 203, VII,[28] 217, VIII,[4] 225, IX.[43]
OTTO II, 36, 42, 43, 50, II,[183] II,[189] II,[195] II,[201] II,[202] II,[209] II,[215] 111, 121, 143, IV,[23] 153, 175, 184, 186, 190, 192, VI,[4] 193, 194, 199, 203, 210, 214.
OTTO III, 37, 38, 44, 45, 50, 51, 53, 58, 59, II,[159] II,[188] II,[202] II,[209] II,[214] III[47] 122, 125, 132, 143, IV,[12] 146, IV,[16] IV,[22] IV,[30] IV,[31] 151-157, IV,[38] IV,[51] 164, 180, 181, 186, 190, 192, 193, 195, 198, 199, 204, 211, 215, 249.
Otto (margrave Carinthia), 158.
Otto (duke Franconia), II,[88] 60, 61.
Otto (Hammerstein), 89, 55, 56, 66, 96, VII.[39]
Otto (duke Lorraine), 118, 139.
Otto (Paris), 116.
Otto (duke Swabia), 37, 59.
Otto (Verdun), 107.
Otto (Vermandois), 130.
Otto William (Burgundy), 65.

Paululf (Capua), 212.
Pepin, 13, I.[21]
Peter of Como, 157, 198.
Peter of Vercelli, 153, 154.
Pilgrim of Cologne, II,[165] II,[184] II,[186] II,[188] IV,[9] IV,[12] 163, 198, VI,[28] 205, 212. VI.[34]
Pilgrim of Passau, II,[186] 183, 185-188, VI,[2] VI.[24]
Poppo of Aquileia, 147.
Poppo of Schleswig, 169.
Poppo of Trier, 138, III,[128] 141.
Poppo of Utrecht, cf. Folcmar.
Poppo I of Würzburg, II,[154] VI,[2] VI.[28]
Poppo II of Würzburg, II.[154]

Ramward of Minden, VII.[28]
Rather of Verona, Liège, 114, IV.[6]
Ravenger (Trier), III.[129]
Razo of Worms, II.[170]
Reginald of Eichstätt, II,[177] IV,[6] VII,[31] 242.
Reginbert of Oldenburg, 176.
Reginbrand of Aarhus, 168.
Regnier (Hainault), III.[130]
Regnier III (Lorraine), 107, 113, 114, 115, 117.
Regnier au Long-Col (Lorraine), I,[83] 102, 103, 210.
Reinhold of Oldenburg, 276.
Rethar of Paderborn, 39
Richar of Liège, 122.
Richar of Tongres, III.[8]
Richard (Cornwall), VII.[2]
Richard (duke Normandy), 117, 131.
Richolf of Trieste, IV.[16]
Richwin of Strassburg, II.[13]
Rim (soldier Hildesheim), II.[158]
Rimbert of Hamburg-Bremen, VI.[11]
ROBERT II (France), 122, 131.
Robert of Metz, 221.
Robert (Paris), 103.
Robert of Trier, 104.
Robert (Troyes), 117.
Robertians (Paris), 116, 117.
Rothert of Cambrai, II,[161] II.[171]
Rothard of Cambrai, 120, 121, 130, 132.
Rothard of Strassburg, 29.
Rothard (Strassburg), II.[186]
Rothulf (Lombardy), IV.[51]
Rudhard of Constance, IV.[9]
RUDOLF (of Burgundy) (France), 103, 105, 161, 211.
Rudolf of Würzburg, VII.[8]
Ruotbert of Speyer, IV.[8]
Ruotbert of Trier, II,[13] II,[88] III,[8] 111, 114.
Ruotger of Trier, 104.

Sagittarius of Gap, I.[17]
Salians, 91, 164.
Salomo of Constance, 19-21, I,[50] 26.
Salonius of Embrun, I.[17]
Seiher (Lens), 132.
Seiher (Lens), 134.
Sicko (soldier Trier), 138, III.[29]
Sidonius Apollinaris of Clermont, 10.
Sidonius of Metz, I.[9]

Siegfrid of Augsburg, IV.[8]
Siégfrid of Gorze, III.[114]
Siegfrid of Münster, II,[186] II.[187]
Sigismund of Halberstadt, II.[171]
Sophia of Gandersheim, 50, 52, 54, 121.
Spannheimer (*Carinthia*), II.[136]
STEPHEN (Hungary), 188.
Svatopluk (*Slav*), 179.
SWEYN FORKBEARD (Denmark), 169.
Swithger of Münster, 64.
Sylvester II (cf. Gerbert), 53, 154, 156, 204, 211, 215.
Tado (*Verona*), 159, 161.
Tagino of Magdeburg, 45, 70, 72, II,[172] II,[173] II,[177] VI,[2] 192, 202, 212, VII,[28] VIII,[1] 231.
Tetdo of Cambrai, 121, 128, 129, 131, 210.
Thangmar (Hildesheim), III.[53]
Thankmar (*Saxony*), 28.
Thedald (*margrave Canossa*), 158.
THEODORIC, I.[9]
Theodoric of (Meissen?), VI.[28]
THEOPHANO, II,[43] 122, 146, VI,[4] 193, 202, 204.
Theotmar of Salzburg, 208.
Thibaud (*Chartres*), 117.
Thieddag of Prague, 181, 245, 246.
Thiedhard of Hildesheim, 203.
Thiedrich of Magdeburg, 71.
Thiedrich of Münster, 64, II,[186] 140.
Thiedrich (*Saxony*), V.[12]
Thietmar of Merseburg, 42, II,[73] 44, 61, 62, 63, 64, 68, 70, II,[167] 71, II,[172] 72, II,[173] II,[181] III,[123] 142, 175, 212, VII,[28] 220, 231-233, 237, 246, IX,[21] IX.[26]
Thietmar of Osnabrück, 75.
Thietmar (*margrave Saxony*), II.[186]
Thietmar (*Saxony*), 64.
Thurgot of Skara, 170.
Tuto of Regensburg, I,[43] 19, 20.

Ubert (*Lombardy*), 160-163, 164.
Udelbert (*Trier*), III.[120]
Udalrich of Augsburg, 24, II,[3] II,[7] II,[13] 31, 33, 34, II,[80] 58, II,[177] II,[185] II,[212] IV,[6] 190, VI,[20] 208, 209, 221, VIII,[14] 228, 229, IX,[25] 248, 250.
Udo of Strassburg, II,[186] IV.[6]
Unni of Hamburg-Bremen, II,[13] VI,[2] 167, IX.[21]
Unwan of Hamburg-Bremen, 60, 69, 70, 72, II,[173] II,[177] II,[186] 169, 170, 203, 217, 219, VII,[56] 237, 247, 248.
Unwan of Paderborn, II.[13]
Uto of Freising, 208.
Vermandois (*France*), 116.
Volkold of Meissen, 193.

Wala of Metz, 102.
Walter of Eichstätt, 74, IV.[9]
Walter (*Lens*), 129, 132.
Walter (*Lens*), 132-135.
Walter of Magdeburg, 70, 71, II,[177] 212, VII,[28] VIII,[12] 231, 232.
Walter of Speyer, IV.[9]
Warin of Cologne, 37.
Warin of Modena, IV.[36]
Warmund of Ivrea, IV.[77]
Wazo of Liège, 120, 121, VI.[27]
Werle (*Saxony*), 64.
Werinher (Wicelin) of Strassburg, 58, IV.[9]
Wibold of Cambrai, II.[161]
Wicfrid of Verdun, 116, IV.[6]
Wichman (*Lorraine*), 140.
Widerolf of Strassburg, IV.[8]
Wigbert of Hildesheim, IX.[19]
Wigbert of Merseburg, 45, 70, II,[172] IX.[21]
Wigerich of Metz, 103, 104.
William (*Lombardy*), 163, IV.[72]
William of Mainz, II,[41] 40, II,[184] 111, 111,[34] IV,[7] IV,[8] 194, 248.
Willigis of Mainz, II,[48] II,[58] 45, 46, 47, 50-53, 122, 136, 181, VI,[6] 194, 195, VI,[28] 202, 203, 204, 215, 218, VII,[50] VIII,[1] 228, 229, VIII,[34] 233, IX.[21]
Wolboldo of Liège, 120, 246.
Wolfgang of Regensburg, II,[89] III,[50] IV,[7] 181, 184, 187, V,[75] 194, 211.
Wolkward (Hildesheim), VIII.[15]

Zacharias (pope), I.[17]
Zacharias of Seben, 208.
ZWENTIBOLD (Lorraine), 102.

INDEX LOCORUM

Aachen, 13, 45, II,[108] II,[208] 111, 157, 194, 195.
Aarhus, II,[212] 168, 169, 172.
Abdinghof, 235, VIII.[66]
Alstedt, II,[144] II,[208] 163.
Andernach, II,[20] 106.
Aquileia, 143, 147, IV,[22] 212.
Arezzo, IV.[32]
Arneburg, VII.[28]
Arnstadt, 35, II,[41] 112.
Asti, IV,[20] IV,[21] 158, 159.
Attigny, I.[34]
Augsburg, I,[30] 31 ff., 49, II,[185] II,[208] II,[210] 190, 208, 209, 215, 221.

Baden, II.[185]
Bamberg, 39, 46, 49, II,[172] 74, II,[210] 134, 136, 182, 183, 201, 204.
Basel, 59, VII.[62]
Bautzen, VII.[28]
Bavaria, I,[53] 23, 24, II,[3] 27, 28, 32, 49, 59, 109, 182, 183, V,[56] 197, 208, 225.
Belizi, V.[36]
Bellinzona, 157.
Belxemgau, VII.[28]
Benevento, 202.
Bergamo, IV,[14] IV.[18]
Bergen, II.[187]
Berncastel, III.[128]
Berashausen, IV.[11]
Björkö, 167.
Bobbio, IV,[22] IV.[31]
Bohemia, 25, 37, 113, 181, 203, VII.[28]
Bologna, IV.[31]
Bonn, 112.
Bothfeld, II.[185]
Brabant, 139.
Brandenburg, 40, 172, 174, 176, 177, V,[36] 232.
Breisach, II,[20] 31, 59.
Breme, 164.
Bremen, 60, II,[201] 202. VII,[28] 217, VII,[44] VIII.[4]
Brescia, IV,[18] 158.
Brixen, 143.
Burgundy, I,[5] 66, 102, 117, VI.[22]

Calabria, 120, 122, III.[51]
Cambrai, 67, 108, 115, III,[47] 116, 121, 125, 126, 129, 130, 131, III,[98] 133, 134, 135, 139, III,[133] 140, 202, 208, 217.
Cambrésis, 113.
Campo di Pietra, 164.
Capo Colonne, IV,[5] 153, 192.
Carinthia, 182, 183, 184.
Carniola, 182, 183, 184.
Cateau-Cambrésis, 133.
Chiavenna, 157.
Chiemgau, II.[186]
Chieti, 164.
Chièvremont, 123, 125, III.[129]
Chur, I,[30] 58, II,[201] II,[208] 143.
Coblenz, 137, 138.
Cologne, 69, II,[201] II,[208] II,[210] 112, 113, 115, 117, 129, III,[133] 140, 144, 194, 195, 197, 198, 201, 205, 215, VII,[62] 240.
Como, IV,[16] IV,[32] 159, 160, 161, 164, 198.
Compiègne, 117.
Constance, 58, VII.[62]
Constantinople, VI,[4] 202.
Corvey, 29, 36, II,[90] II,[187] II.[208]
Cremona, IV,[20] 150, 157, 159.
Danube, 183, 184, 242.
Denmark, 167, 168, 169.
Dordrecht, 140.
Dortmund, II,[198] 201.
Driezele, V.[36]
Duisburg, III.[5]

East March, 182, 183, 185, 186, 187, 188, 208.
Egypt, 153.
Eichstätt, 89, 182, VII,[14] 221, 222, 242, 245.
Eibe, 171, V,[16] 175, V,[24] V,[25] 177, 179, V,[34] 180, 182, 183.
182, 183.
Elbe-Saale, 41, 170, 171.
Elten, 140.
England, 140, 169, VII.[2]
Enns, 185.
Ennsburg, 186.
Erlaffa, V.[56]
Er(in)stein, II.[185]
Ervete, VIII,[66] VIII.[68]

Fabricca, 158.
Fischa, 184.
Flanders, 125, 131, 134, 135.
Forli, IV,[23]
Forlimpopoli, IV.[22]
Fosse, VII.[51]
France, I,[17] 101, 102, 103, 104, 111, III,[19] 118, 135.
Franconia, 28, II,[83] 182.
Frankfort, 47, 53, II,[101] 54, 57, II,[203] V,[46] 201.
Freising, II,[4] II,[201] 183, 224, VIII.[7]
Frisia, 140.
Fritzlar, 31.
Friuli, IV.[22]
Fruttuaria, 160.
Fühnen, 168, 169.
Fulda, II,[20] II,[21] II, [79] II,[185] II,[187] II,[205] II,[215] VII.[34]

Gandersheim, II,[88] 39, 48, 50 ff., II,[101] 169, VI,[23] 204, IX.[23]
Garda, 159.
Gaul, 10, I.[5]
Geisleben, II.[101]
Gernrode, 64.
Ghent, 131.
Giebichenstein, 203.
Gnesen, 44, 169, 180, 181.
Goslar, II.[101]
Gran, 169, 188.
Grona, II,[101] 71.
Gummern, V.[36]

Hainault, 113, 125, 139.
Halberstadt, 40-44, II,[159] II,[171] II,[210]
Hamburg, II,[20] II,[159] V,[16] 219.
Hamburg-Bremen, 167, 168, 169, 172.
Hammelburg, II.[20]
Hammerstein, 55, 57.
Hattuariergau, 140.
Havelburg, 40, 172, 174, 176, 177, V,[36] 232.
Heiligenkreuz, V.[51]
Hellweg, II.[208]
Herrenried, 89.
Hersfeld, II.[90]
Herwerden, 141.

Hildesheim, 48, 50 ff., II,[159] II,[201] 176, V,[31] 178, 193, 194, VII,[8] 216, 227, 229-231, IX,[19] IX.[23]
Hilwardshausen, 52.
Höchst, 56.
Hohenaltheim, 21, 22, I,[77] 24, 32.
Holland, 139, 141.
Hougard, 140.
Hungary, 184, 185, 187, 188, IX.[18]

Illertissen, 35.
Ingelheim, II,[185] II,[203] 112, 168, 201.
Isen, II.[4]
Italy, I,[5] 41, 42, II,[188] 96, 108, 111, 114, III,[51] 122, 142, 198, VI,[32] 202, 204, VII,[15] 214, 215, 243, 249, 250.
Ivrea, 153, 154, 155, 161.

Klein-Maria-Zell, V.[51]
Klosterneuburg, V.[51]
Kremsmünster, II,[4] 133, 185.

Langenzenn, 34.
Laon, III,[9] 132, 210.
Lechfeld, II,[3] 41, 112, 183, 190, 209.
Lesdain, VII.[57]
Liège, 108, 116, 118, 119, III,[48] 120, 121, 122, 123, 125, 130, 139, 140, 202, 219, VIII,[36] 251.
Lilienfeld, V.[51]
Lobbes, 120, VII.[53]
Lodi, IV,[20] 158.
Loire, I.[9] 111.
Lombardy, IV,[1] 145, 151, 153.
Lorch, 185-188.
Lorraine, I,[53] 48, 60, 96, 144, 146, 197, 202, 215.
Lorsch, 110, VII,[59] 235.
Lotzau, V.[36]
Louvain, 139.

Maastricht, II.[215]
Magdeburg, 39-44, 65, II,[159] 70, II,[183] II,[187] II,[201] II,[208] II,[210] 169, 172, 174, 176, V,[36] 180, 181, 188, 192, 203, 212, 217, 226, 231, IX.[43]
Main, 182.
Mainz, II,[20] 31, 32, 40, 48, 50 ff., II,[102] 55, 56, 63, 66, 85, II,[201] II,[208] II,[210] 96, 172, 176, 181, 194, 195, 196, 197, 203, 204, 205, VII,[8] 215, VII,[34] VII,[82] VIII,[34] 233, IX.[23]
Malkanroth, V.[23]
Malines, VII.[53]
Maria Einsiedeln, 187.
Mattsee, 185.
Mäuseturn, I.[47]
Mautern, 186.
Mecklenburg, 176.
Meissen, 42-44, 45, 102, 171, 172, 174, 175, V,[36] 220, 231, 232.
Melk, V.[51]
Memleben, II.[208]
Merseburg, 40-44, II,[161] II,[208] II,[210] 171, 173, 174, 178, 192, 204, 231, 232.
Metz, II,[20] 71, 103, 111, 116, 135, 136, 137, III,[123] VII,[8] 212.
Meuse, 102, 103, 140, 219.
Milan, 159, 161.
Milzanigau, V.[36]
Minden, II,[159] II,[201] VII.[8]
Misteltach, 186.
Modena, 158, 198.
Moesia, 188.
Monte Cassino, 212.
Montmartre, 210.
Moosburg, II.[4]
Moravia, 185.
Moselle, 102, 137.
Mouzon, III.[9]
Münster, 85.

Namur, 139.
Naples, 212.
Naumburg, 175.
Neuburg, II.[46]
Nidrinhof, V.[58]
Niederaltaich, 183.
Nimwegen, II,[208] 134, 140, VI[6]
Nirechowa, V.[36]
Nitzau, V.[36]
Nördlingen, IX.[18]
Nogelles, VII.[57]
Norway, 169, V,[7]
Novara, IV,[22] IV,[26] 154, 159, 160, 162.

Oberaltaich, II,[181] II.[187]
Odensee, 168.
Oder, 171, V,[34] 179.
Oldenburg, 172, 176.
Orba, 163.
Orleans, I.[18]
Osnabrück, II.[90]
Otting, 185.
Ottobeuren, II.[89]

Paderborn, II,[201] II,[208] II.[210] 138, 217, 237, 239.
Palás, III.[110]
Pannonia, 188.
Paris, 103, 105, 106, 210.
Parma, IV,[20] IV,[26] 161, 198.
Passau, II,[4] 37, II,[198] II,[201] II,[212] 169, 182, 183, 185, 186, 187, 188.
Pavia, 44, IV,[3] IV,[18] IV,[31] 151, 153, 157, 158, 159, 160, 162, 164, 198, IX.[43]
Pechau, V.[36]
Penna, 164.
Péronne, III.[103]
Pfalzel, III.[128]
Piacenza, IV,[18] 158.
Piedmont, 151
Pöhlde, 51, 53, II,[101] 54, 121.
Poland, 180.
Posen, 180.
Prague, 181, VII.[28]
Pritzerbe, V.[36]
Prussia, 181.

Quedlinburg, 44, 45, II.[208]

Rangau, II.[201]
Ravenna, II,[31] 146, 149, IV,[22] 150, 190, 202.
Regensburg, 23, II,[4] 33, 34, 89, II,[208] II,[210] 181, 182, 183, 218, IX.[18]
Reggio, IV,[20] IV,[21] IV.[26]
Reichenau, II.[187]
Reifnitz, 183.
Rheims, 17, III,[9] 107, 116, 117, 125, 134, 135.
Rhine, I,[9] 17, 66, 101, 103, 104, 108, 111, 139.
Ripen, II,[212] 168, 172.
Romagna, 149.
Rome, 40, 43, 44, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 132, 138, IV,[1] 154, 158, 188, 190, 192, 202, 211, 243, 249, IX.[37]

Rossano, VI.[4]
Rümlingen, 112
Russia, 172.

Saale, 175, 183.
Saalfeld, II.[25]
Sailly, 132.
St. Agatha, IV,[22] IV,[36] 154, 155, 162, IV.[71]
St. Emmeram, II,[80] II,[171] II,[187] 173.
St. Florian, II.[4]
St. Gall, 20.
St. Moritz, 42.
St. Pölten, II.[4]
St. Vanne, 220.
Salerno, 212.
Salzburg, I,[30] II,[80] 182, 183, V,[51] 184, 185, 187, 188, 197, VI,[24] 224, VIII.[9]
Saxony, I,[51] I,[53] I,[56] 26, 29, 38, 59, 64, II,[186] 174, 175, 176, 202, 226.
Schäftlarn, II.[4]
Scheldt, 103, 104, 125, 131.
Schleswig, II,[212] 168, 172.
Schonen, 169.
Schweinfurt, 211.
Seben, II.[31]
Seben-Brixen, II,[215] 183.
Seehausen, 232.
Seeland, 169.
Seligenstadt, II,[101] 54, 55.
Setleboresdorf, V.[24]
Skara, 170.
Soissons, I.[34]
Spain, I.[5]
Sparrone, 159.
Speyer, VII.[62]
Stade, II.[186]
Stauf, 218.
Steinkirchen, 184, V.[56]
Strassburg, II,[201] II,[210] 164, 215, VII.[62]
Styria, 182, 184.
Swabia, I,[53] 21, 23, 33, 124.
Swabmünchen, 34.
Sweden, 169, 176.

Tegernbach, II.[4]
Tegernsee, II,[3] II,[4] 183.
Thuringia, 19, I,[51] 175.
Tivoli, 211.
Tongres, 119.
Tortona, IV,[18] IV,[23] IV.[31]
Toul, 116, 136.
Traungau, 186.
Trent, II,[4] II,[195] 143.
Tribur, 18, I,[45] II,[208] 193.
Trier, II,[215] 103, 104, III,[6] 108, 112, 113, 116, 136, 137, III,[120] 138, III,[129] III,[133] 144, 194, 197, VI,[22] 205, VII.[14]
Troja, 212.
Troyes, 117.
Tuscany, 149, IV.[32]

Upplade, 140.
Utrecht, II,[49] II,[190] II,[210] 108, 121, 139, 140, 218.

Val Assolo, IV.[22]
Val Tellina, IV.[22]
Valenciennes, 131.
Vercelli, IV,[18] IV,[22] 152-160, 162, 164, IV.[74]
Verden, 37, II,[185] VII.[58]
Verdun, 116, 130, 136, 220, 224.
Vermandois, 129, 132.
Verona, 114, 158, 159, 164.
Vicenza, IV.[22]
Villach, 183.
Vinchy, 130.

Walbeck, II.[186]
Waldsassen, II.[201]
Wallhausen, II.[208]
Weissenburg, II.[187]
Werben, V.[31]
Werra, II.[208]
Wienerwald, 184, 185.
Wieselburg, V.[56]
Wirinholt, VII.[39]
Wörth, II.[4]
Worms, II,[58] 60, 61, II,[185] II,[201] II,[208] II,[210] 96, 193, VII,[30] 220, VII,[59] VII,[60] 233, 234, 235, 251.
Würzburg, 47, 49, II,[189] II,[201] II,[210] 182, VII,[34] 222, 242, 243, 244.

Zeitz, 42-45, 171, 172, 174, 175.
Ziesar, V.[36]